HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

AUGUST 1948 PRICE 1s. 3d. NET.

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—The Relationship between Morals and Dogma—Natural Law—Evangelical Christianity—The Present-Day Tasks of the Christian Church . . 281

II. THE BACKGROUND OF THE TERM 'SON OF MAN.' By the Reverend JOHN BOWMAN, B.D., D.Phil.(Oxon), The University, Leeds 283

III. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 288
2. The Christian Year 289

IV. LITERATURE 297

V. UNSOLVED NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS: THE PLACE OF ESCHATOLOGY IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL. By the Reverend C. K. BARRETT, B.D., The University, Durham . 302

VI. RELIGION AND THE VARIETY OF RELIGIONS. By Professor H. L. STEWART, M.A., D.Phil., Dalhousie University, Halifax 306

VII. ENTRE NOUS—Whitby—'Only' 308

VOLUME LIX. No. 11

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH
EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

AN IMPORTANT ADDITION TO THE 'STUDIES IN THEOLOGY'

THE POETRY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

By THEODORE ROBINSON, D.D.

'Slight in texture and deliberately popular in presentation; but it is a most convenient handbook and admirably meets the need of those who would like to catch up with the present state of O.T. study and the prevalent hypotheses bearing on the Books of Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Lamentations, and the Song of Songs.'—*The Guardian.* 6s. net

OTHER VOLUMES IN THIS SERIES NOW AVAILABLE AT 6s. *NET*

Religious Ideas of the Old Testament	H. WHEELER ROBINSON
The History of Israel	H. WHELLER ROBINSON
The Christian Estimate of Man	SYDNEY CAVE
Christian Thought to the Reformation	H. B. WORKMAN
Christian Thought Since Kant	E. CALDWELL MOORE
Theology of the Epistles	H. A. A. KENNEDY
Groundwork of the Philosophy of Religion	ATKINSON LEE
Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel	THEODORE ROBINSON
The Doctrine of the Atonement	J. K. MOZLEY
Form Criticism	E. B. REDLICH

GERALD DUCKWORTH, 3 HENRIETTA ST., LONDON, W.C.2

Distinctive Printing

WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your **PRINTING** and **PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS**

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.

PRINTERS • • BOOKBINDERS

TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON Ltd.

LITHOGRAPHERS • MAP PRINTERS

EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

NEW BOOKS

The Early Methodist People

The Fernley-Hartley Lecture 1948

By Dr. LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A. 12*s.* 6*d. net*

This work has involved an enormous amount of research amongst the diaries, intimate journals and memoirs of the first two generations of Methodist people. The survey includes their spiritual experiences, personal conduct, family-life and modes of worship. It aims at showing the emergence in the rank and file of a social conscience, and at relating them to Christian and democratic ideals.

Charles Wesley as Revealed by his Letters

By FRANK BAKER, B.A., B.D. 5*s. net*

Neither Charles Wesley nor his letters are as well known as they might be. Yet that great letter-writer John Wesley once said 'writing letters is my brother's talent rather than mine.' A perusal of this book will show how far such high praise is merited. Quotations from over two hundred letters (mostly unpublished) are skilfully blended into a fascinating story which should prove of real interest to the general reader as well as to the student. (The Wesley Historical Society Lecture 1948).

of all Booksellers

LONDON: THE EPWORTH PRESS

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is always room for a book that bears traces of freshness and originality. Mr. Ian HENDERSON'S *Can Two Walk Together?* [1] commends itself by the creative purpose it displays, its sure grasp of philosophical principle, and its frequent pungency of expression. Mr. HENDERSON has just been elected to a Theological Chair in Glasgow University, and this first volume of his gives somewhat welcome proof that he will not be afraid to travel along new avenues of thought. All the way through it is characterized by trenchant individual thinking, and the reader is conscious of a first-class mind grappling at close quarters with some of the main issues of our time.

Mr. HENDERSON sub-titles his work *The Quest for a Secular Morality*, and he is concerned to work out the relations between dogma and morality. The argument is close-knit and not always easy to follow. There are pages of intricate philosophical reasoning, as when Mr. HENDERSON is dealing with the Master of Balliol in the discussion of 'My Station and its Duties,' but there are flashes of humour, and quite often forthright pronouncements that are compelling by their very candour. Take this, for example. 'Bradley had no small success in winning the academic world for Hegelianism with all its renunciation of the dogma of Natural Law. The philosophical schools of Oxford and of universities like Glasgow, which take their cue from Oxford, nailed their colours to the Absolute. Bradley, Bosanquet, the two Cairds, Mackenzie, Muirhead, these are formidable figures. They all represented a philosophical school to which the dogma of Natural Law is anathema. Yet if we are right in maintaining the soundness of Troeltsch's contention that is the very dogma for which this country in the last thirty years has fought the two bloodiest wars in history. This extraordinary discrepancy between academic and popular thinking and the inability of the former to affect the dogmas which govern the thinking of the ordinary man has for long gone unnoticed.'

[1] Nisbet; 10s. net.

The book is much concerned with Natural Law, and may well be read in conjunction with the S.C.M. publication, edited by A. R. Vidler and W. A. Whitehouse, on the same theme. Mr. HENDERSON deals with the question whether there is a relationship between morals and dogma, and if so, what is the nature of the relationship. He begins by asking whether there is in fact a body of moral judgments that does not depend on dogmatic assumptions. 'Is there a kind of Highest Common Factor of moral agreement among High Churchmen and atheists, Nazis and Communists? Even at the risk of offending divines who are concerned to maintain that the rejection of Christianity would bring with it complete moral collapse, I think we should at least hope that such a measure of moral agreement exists.' Discussion of Natural Law follows, with special reference to expositions of it by Father Rickaby and Sir W. D. Ross, and the conclusion reached is that 'if Natural Law is a dogma which some men have accepted and others rejected it cannot be the moral code which unites them in spite of their dogmatic differences.'

What then of the morality of 'My Station and its Duties'? Does it succeed where Natural Law failed? Here follows an acute discussion of Lord Lindsay's exposition in 'The Two Moralities' and elsewhere, in which Mr. HENDERSON'S firm philosophical grasp is manifest. 'To the sceptic who cannot find in moral rules the self-evidence ascribed to them by exponents of the morality of Natural Law such as Father Rickaby and Dr. Ross, Dr. Lindsay renders much the same service that Kant renders to those disturbed by Hume's devastating criticism of the category of causality.' Mr. HENDERSON concludes, however, that 'the morality of my station' is not so independent of dogma as we might think. He passes then to Brunner's discussion of it in 'The Divine Imperative,' 'the most important book in Christian Ethics that has appeared for many a year,' and after further discussion declares that 'in the last resort the morality of my station is not what we

went out in search for, a morality accessible to all men irrespective of their dogmas. Its relations with dogma are too complicated for that.'

If then there be no independent morality, it becomes necessary to take seriously the primacy of dogma, and to examine carefully the grounds upon which dogmas are based. Mr. HENDERSON then proceeds to find why our ancestors in this country came to adopt one particular set of dogmas, those of Natural Law, and next to discover whether we, their descendants, should reject or modify this particular set of dogmas. He warns us that the attempt to give dogmas in general a theoretical, non-dogmatic basis is a hopeless one. 'You cannot base them on the Bible or the Church for belief in the Bible or the Church is itself a highly dogmatic position. You cannot base them on experience, for most dogmas are in flat contradiction to experience. Of none is this more true than that of the doctrine of Natural Law.' 'The curious thing is that many Humanists do not see this. They think that in holding on to the immanent dogmas of Natural Law which Christianity shares with Stoicism and abandoning the transcendent dogmas peculiar to Christianity, they are holding fast to what is self-evident and giving up what is wildly speculative. Actually it is the other way round, only if you accept Christianity do you find the immanent dogmas of Natural Law becoming less wildly fictitious.'

The Rev. Randolph Carleton CHALMERS, Th.D., Associate Secretary, Board of Evangelism and Social Service, The United Church of Canada, has followed up his useful exposition of Christian Doctrine ('See the Christ Stand') with an Evangelical Interpretation of Christianity of which the title—*The Pure Celestial Fire*—recalls the Wesleys.[1] It would almost appear as though 'Evangelical Christianity' were the title of the book as originally planned. At any rate the headings of the fourteen chapters suggest this: its meaning, its revelation, its experience, its realism, its redemption, its faith, its magnitudes, its fellowship, its piety, its preaching, its song, its witness, its purpose, its task.

Let us concentrate on the last chapter, dealing with the task of Evangelical Christianity. But note first the characteristics of Evangelicalism as tabulated by this author: (1) it stands for personal freedom; (2) it stresses the immediacy of communion with God; (3) it makes Christ central in faith; (4) it believes in 'Scriptural Christianity'; (5) it draws upon the power of the Holy Spirit; (6) it is marked by 'a passion for souls'; (7) it depends for its assurance upon the sovereign grace of God in Christ.

With this conception of the Christian religion the author faces the present-day tasks of the Christian Church. He represents these as threefold. First, there is the *theological* task; what type of theology should Evangelical Christianity seek to revive in our time?

The author is of opinion that the theological renaissance which the Church needs to-day must centre in the Incarnation. He commends the Church of Scotland's Report, 'God's Will for Church and Nation,' for its insistence that the crucial questions for Christian theology now gather round the Christian doctrine of man, and that we cannot be concerned about the Christian doctrine of man without taking seriously the doctrine of the Incarnation and its implications for our human life.

How can the Church carry out this theological task? There cannot be a revival of theology apart from a revival of vital faith, and there cannot be a revival of vital faith without a renewed study of the Bible. In addition, the spirit of theological inquiry should be quickened, that the things most surely believed in by Christians in all ages may be examined and re-examined. This will lead to a re-writing of our theological creeds and confessions. We should do for our time what the authors of the Creeds of Nicea, Chalcedon, and Westminster did for their times.

Here the author quotes Dr. Van Dusen: 'None of the great historic theologies of the Church, even that of the so-called ecumenical councils, can furnish the structure for a sound and enduring theology for world Christendom. For each of the great systems of Christian theology—Eastern, Roman (whether Augustinian or Thomistic), Reformation, Modern—was wrought out to meet the peculiar problems of a particular crisis in the life of the Church, and in the vocabulary and assumptions of that time.' (We wonder what the 'Modern' system of theology is.)

Secondly, there is the *cultural* task; what has Evangelical Christianity to say about this?

The Church must first come to a realization of the depth and character of the cultural crisis to-day. Modern culture, it has been said, is sensory, empirical, secular, and 'this-worldly.' For millions of people it has made the means of

[1] Ryerson Press, Toronto; $3.50.

life more important than ends, and has come to place all the emphasis on things. Religion is regarded as irrelevant to life, or a barrier against religion's claims is set up by a 'prius of doubt.'

What the Church must do is to discover a fresh approach to the modern mind, so that the cultural atmosphere may be transformed into one that will enable a Christian to live and move and have his being. The Christian message must be very specific and point to those elements in the gospel which are most relevant to the present cultural crisis. In particular, it must proclaim the sovereignty of God, who controls all of life, and calls upon man to recognize and worship Him in every department of life.

Arnold J. Toynbee says that the only way out of the impasse of modern civilization is not that of archaism nor that of futurism nor that of detachment; it is the way of transfiguration, to be born anew by the power of the Spirit. It is the 'palingenesia' of which Jesus spoke when He said to Nicodemus: 'Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God.'

Finally, there is the *ecumenical* task; what is to be said here in the light of the Evangelical spirit?

Evangelicals have found themselves at home in various forms of Church polity—Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Congregational, the form of the Church being regarded by them as secondary to the spirit of the Church; and they object when, say, Episcopacy or Apostolicity is claimed to be, not the *bene esse*, but the *esse* of the Church. The Evangelical witness should serve to keep the Church in its ecumenical movement from wrecking itself on the rocks and reefs of externalism, formalism, legalism and all the technics of religion. Only as the Church remains near to 'the pure celestial fire' will her witness avail.

Another peril which ecumenicity must avoid is that which would come from a watering down of Christian theology. There could be no awakening through ecumenicity or otherwise unless the Church maintains the whole truth as it is in Christ. It has been well said that 'to pursue unity simply for the sake of human togetherness, or because a strong ecumenical Church can make a decisive contribution to civilization, is to give allegiance to an empty idol; it is to pursue a fatuous, if roseate, bubble.'

None the less, this author welcomes the ecumenical movement, and pleads for organic union wherever possible, for the mutual recognition of each other's ministries, and for closer co-operation among the churches. In this matter of closer co-operation he hails the Ecumenical Training Centre for Christian Leadership, established at Geneva in 1946, as a step in the right direction.

The Background of the Term 'Son of Man.'

By the Reverend John Bowman, B.D., D.Phil.(Oxon.), Lecturer in Hebrew and Old Testament Studies, The University of Leeds.

The term 'son of man' occurs relatively infrequently in the Old Testament. It is generally understood to be merely a poetic synonym for man. In this article we shall glance at the more important occurrences, and try to see them in their original context. We cannot stop short with that, but must investigate interpretations of the term which are found in the Jewish Targums, Midrashim and Pseudepigrapha, as these reflect probable trends in Jewish interpretation such as might have already occurred in the time of Jesus.

In Ps $8^{4(5)}$ 'what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man (בֶּן־אָדָם), that thou visitest him?' בֶּן־אָדָם stands for mankind in its creaturely weakness; but it is man's glorious place in creation, little lower than Elohim (Targ. and A.V. 'angels'), and his dominion over all beasts that evokes the Psalmist's question. The thought is along the lines of Gn 1^{26}. Yet the Psalm is probably pre-exilic (cf. Oesterley, *The Psalms*, i. 139). Surely the Jews had meditations on creation before the Exile!

Ps 80 requires more attention; *vv.*$^{15(16)}$ and $^{17(18)}$ have practically the same ending—*v.*$^{15(16)}$ 'the son (A.V. the branch) that thou hast strengthened for thyself,' *v.*$^{17(18)}$ 'the son of man whom thou hast strengthened for thyself.' The Psalm refers to Northern Israel (cf. *v.*$^{2(3)}$, Rachel tribes specified). Oesterley (*ib.*, ii. 366) suggests it reflects conditions in Ephraim after 721 B.C. There seems no absolutely compelling reason to prefer exilic or post-exilic dating. Whatever may be the textual authority of בֵּן in *v.*$^{15(16)}$ (cf. however Ps 2^{7}) *v.*$^{17(18)}$ seems an integral part of the Psalm. Ben-Adam

(*v.*[17(18)]) though perhaps influenced by Ps 8[4(5)] is here used to personify Israel. If Psalm 80 be actually pre-exilic here we may have a Psalm which might have influenced Ezekiel. Note *v.*[1(2)] 'Thou that sittest upon the cherubim,' and *v.*[17(18)] 'the son of man whom thou hast strengthened for thyself.' God 'that sitteth on the cherubim' shone forth in the theophany at the River Chebar (Ezk 1) though it was not until the Temple vision Ezk 10[15] that Ezekiel recognized the *Hayyoth* as Cherubim; in Ezk 2[1] the voice from the Throne addressed the prostrate Ezekiel 'son of man stand on thy feet'.[1] Strength is given him to stand on his feet, and also to face his fellow-Israelites unflinchingly (cf. Ezk 3[8. 9]). Though this last might be influenced by Jer 1[18], it is God's strengthening of the erstwhile weak son of man in both Ps 80 and in Ezekiel that is striking.

In the use of 'son of man' in Ezekiel there is also a reminiscence of Ps 8[4(5)] where the weak *Ben-Adam* was given dominion over the beasts. The *Hayyoth* of Ezk 1 (A.V. 'living creatures') could be translated 'beasts.' Each had four faces, a man's, a lion's, an ox's, an eagle's. A Jewish source (*c.* A.D. 200) (*T.B. Hag.* 13b) comments: 'The King among living creatures is a lion, the King among domestic beasts is an ox, the King among birds is an eagle, but man takes his place proudly above them, and God takes his place proudly above them all and above the universe.' All are under the feet (Ps 8[6(7)]) of the man on the throne above their heads. Kimchi (A.D. 1160–1235) rejects the common view 'that Ezekiel is called "son of man" that he might not grow proud and reckon himself as one of the angels because he had seen this great vision. But my opinion' he says, 'is that because he had seen the face of a man in the Heavenly Chariot, God made known to him that he, Ezekiel, is good and acceptable in His sight, since he is son of man, not son of ox, not son of eagle.' The man Ezekiel has more in common with God 'the man on the throne' than the *Hayyoth*. The early Midrash also (Lev. R. 2[8]) taught that 'son of man' was an honourable term of address to Ezekiel. Dn 8[17] in his vision by *a river* falls, like Ezekiel, on his face, then Gabriel addresses him as 'son of man' (*Ben-Adam*). This term of address[2] seems borrowed from Ezekiel; there is no rebuking of possible pride; he may be weak, but, like Ezekiel, strength is given him.[3] It is not to be excluded that the title in Ezekiel may imply kinship with mankind (cf. Lev. R. 2[8] (on Lv 1[2])). 'Man' is an expression of love (of God for man; cf. M. Ab. 3[15]) and of brotherliness (through common Adamic descent). But the Hebrews were not mere humanists.

So far the Hebrew evidence; before discussing Dn 7[13] itself Aramaic, let us turn to the Aramaic Targums and their renderings of Ps 8[4(5)] 80[17(18)] and Ezk 2[1], etc. The Targums provide traditional Jewish interpretations of the Scriptures. While the extant Targums vary in antiquity, and have late redactional elements, they may enshrine interpretations earlier than the written Targums. In Ps 8[4(5)] the Targum renders both 'man' and 'the son of man' by בַּר נָשָׁא. In Ps 80[15(16)] 'the son' (A.V. the branch) is translated מַלְכָּא מְשִׁיחָא (King Messiah) and in *v.*[18] the 'son of man' is rendered בַּר נָשׁ, the Aramaic equivalent of *Ben-Adam*. The almost complete identity of *vv.*[15(16)] and [17(18)] might suggest that Bar-Nash here is a synonym for Malka-M'shiha especially as LXX has *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* in both cases.[4] The *Peshitto*, too, has ܒܪ ܢܫ in both cases.[5] Nestle (in *E.T.*, xi. p. 238) argued with reason the versions prove that 'the intrusion is old and though the redaction of the Targum is late, yet the explanation may be even older than the time of Christ.'

In the Ezekiel Targum the Man (אָדָם) on the Throne is translated אֱנָשָׁא: so also wherever אָדָם occurs, *e.g.* 1[5] 1[8] 1[10], etc., apart from Ezekiel's title בֶּן אָדָם which is rendered בַּר אֱנָשָׁא. This last, Professor G. S. Duncan (*Jesus, Son of Man*, 135) holds was the Aramaic expression used by Jesus and underlying *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. This choice is apparently made to avoid ascribing to Jesus the use of any title with messianic or apocalyptic significance. But is *Bar-Adam* the Aramaic for 'son of man'? Did the Targumic translator intend it to be so understood? Kimchi on Ezk 2[1] remarks the Targumist could have translated *Ben-Adam* by *Bar-Enasha*.[6] Dalman[7] realized *Bar-Adam* meant not 'son of man' in Aramaic but 'son of Adam'! The Targumist in using *Bar-Adam* presumably believed that the Hebrew *Ben-Adam*[8] as applied to Ezekiel referred to him as descendant of Adam,

[1] Son of man occurs over 100 times in Ezekiel.

[2] Cf. also the setting of the vision, and the man's voice (*v.*[16]; cf. Ezk 1[28]).

[3] Cf. Abbott, *Son of Man*, 46.

[4] The possibility exists that LXX understood בֶּן in *v.*[15(16)] as equivalent to בֶּן אָדָם (*v.*[17(18)]) and that the Targum interpreted בֶּן messianically in the light of Ps 2[7].

[5] On the possible Jewish origin of the *Peshitto* cf. Kahle, *Cairo Genizah*, 180.

[6] The *Peshitto* translated both *Adam* (Ezk 1[26]) and *Ben-Adam* (Ezk 2[1], etc.) by *Bar-Nasha*.

[7] *The Words of Jesus*, 237; cf. Driver, Gn 1[26], Abbott, *ib.*, 73, 108 f.

[8] The late Yalkut Reubeni (p. 72) understood *Adam* here as an anagram for Adam, David, Messiah. The even later cabbalistic פְּתַח־אֵרִי held: 'Ezekiel was called *Ben-Adam* because his spirit's source was the First Man, and he is the *Adam Ha-Kadmon*.' Such ideas may underlie the retention of the Hebrew *Adam* in *Bar-Adam*.

made in the image of God (Gn 1^{26}). Abbott postulated *Bar-Adam* as Jesus' self-designation, with possible reference in Jesus' mind to the First Man; and he sees this too in the Lucan genealogy.

Abbott regarded Ezekiel as the sole influence in Jesus' choice of title.[1] Yet important for our study of the term 'son of man' is the vision in Dn 7, certain features of which recall Ezk 1. The throne of the Ancient of days (Dn 7^{9-10}) resembles that in Ezekiel in having wheels, and in being afire (Dn 7^{9}; cf. Ezk 1^{4}). Ezekiel's Divine Throne-Chariot comes in the cloud (Ezk 1^{4} עָנָן גָּדוֹל); in Dn 7^{13} 'one like a son of man came with the clouds of heaven' (עִנְנֵי שְׁמַיָּא). Another point of similarity is the four beasts (חֵיוָן) Dn 7^{3}; cf. Ezk 1^{5}. There is no resemblance in function or appearance between Ezekiel's or Daniel's beasts, but in both there is the antithesis between man and beast (cf. Ps 8). Despite the very free use of the furnishings of Ezekiel's vision, it is significant that in pondering the Divine government of the world, the Chariot vision of Ezekiel suggests itself to Daniel's mind.

The usual view that the 'one like a son of a man' (*Kᵉ-Bar-Enash*) Dn 7^{13} is not to be understood as a specific individual, but as a symbol for the glorified Israel is likely correct. The four Gentile kingdoms are signified by dreadful beasts, but Israel is truly human.[2] Confirming this view is the angel's explanation, the 'son of man' is apparently identified with the saints of the Most High (*v.*^{18}). Such is the original sense of Daniel's 'son of man'; but it may not have been the explanation given a hundred or a hundred and fifty years later. Professor T. W. Manson (*The Teaching of Jesus*, 227 ff.) has apparently minimized this in his brilliant exposition of what it meant for Jesus. To establish by modern critical methods what *Kᵉ-bar-Enash* meant to Daniel, may throw no light on what Jesus' contemporaries took it to mean, for critical methods were then unknown. Midrashic interpretation cares nothing for the original meaning, nor does it read statements in their contexts; it seizes a word, a phrase, and utilizes it as a peg for extraneous ideas.[3]

A priori we cannot say that *Kᵉ-Bar-Enash* was still interpreted collectively in Jesus' day. Rashi (A.D. 1040–1105) who reflects traditional Jewish interpretation declared: '"one like a son of man" is the King Messiah.'[4] It is objected that the earliest certain identification in Rabbinic sources of *Kᵉ-Bar-Enash* and the individual Messiah is dated 3rd century A.D. in Joshua ben Levi's harmonizing of Zech 9^{9} with Dn 7^{13}: 'If Israel are worthy, "with the clouds of heaven"; if not "lowly and riding upon an ass".' But the messianic application of Dn 7^{13} is presumed usual,[5] as indeed was that of Zech 9^{9}.[6] Indeed, a clear example probably no later than *c.* A.D. 200 is Num. R. 13^{14}, 'How do we know of the King Messiah (that he will reign supreme on sea and land)? Because it is written "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth" (Ps 72^{8}). How do we know he will hold sway on land? Because it is written, "all kings shall prostrate themselves before him: all nations shall serve him" (*ib.* ^{11}), and it also says, "Behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man . . . and there was given unto him dominion . . . that all the people . . . should serve him," etc. (Dn $7^{13f.}$); "and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth"' (*ib.* 2^{35}) (Soncino trans.). This is important in showing that the Image and Stone vision (Dn 2) was recognized as parallel to Dn 7, both Stone and *Kᵉ-Bar-Enash* being understood as referring to an individual—the Messiah.

A story in *P.T. Yoma* 5 probably sheds light on Daniel's *Kᵉ-Bar-Enash*. For forty years Simeon the Just (*c.* 200 B.C.) as high priest went on Yom Kippur into the Holy of Holies and was always accompanied by an old man[7] clad in white and veiled in white. This reminds one strikingly of the Ancient of Days (Aged One) 'whose garment was white as snow.' Referring to this story R. Abbahu (*c.* A.D. 279–320) said 'It is written "No man shall be even in the Tent of Meeting when the High Priest goes in to make atonement in the Holy Place, until he come out" (Lv 16^{17}); not even them about whom it is written, "The likeness of their faces was the face of a man,"[8] shall be in the Tent of Meeting."' He (Abbahu) said 'Who tells me that he was בַּר נַשׁ, I say it was the Holy One.' *Bar-Nash* cannot here mean merely a human being, otherwise Ezk 1^{10}[9] would not have been cited; *Bar-Nash* must include here angels as well. Abbahu audaciously declared it was God Himself.[10] Was it because his colleagues identified *Bar-Nash* with *Kᵉ-Bar-Enash* (Dn 7^{13})? In LXX (Dn 7^{13}) *Kᵉ-Bar-Enash* comes 'as one ancient of days.'

[1] In Abbott's exhaustive 'Parallelisms between Ezekiel and Jesus,' *ib.*, 82–107, interdependence is over-emphasized; other factors are neglected or minimized. Volter's *Die Menschensohn-Frage* stresses likewise parallels between Ezekiel and Jesus, but finds nothing of the son of man in the heavenly apocalyptic sense.

[2] Cf. Ps. $80^{13(14).\ 17(18)}$.

[3] Jesus Himself is represented as using Midrashic interpretation; cf. Mk $12^{26.\ 27.\ 35-37}$.

[4] Ibn Ezra (12th century), a critical scholar, understood Israel as meant.

[5] Cf. Moore, *Judaism*, ii. 334 f.; *T. B. Sanh.* 98a.

[6] *Gn. R.* 75^{6}, 98^{9}, etc.

[7] Old age is the garment of God (*Gn. R.* 58^{9}).

[8] Ezk 1^{10} (the *Hayyoth*).

[9] Cf. *Peshitto*, Ezk 1^{10}, *Bar-Nasha*.

[10] Even Moses did not actually see God (*Lev. R.* 1^{14}).

Again, Abbahu (*P.T. Taan.* 2[1]) undoubtedly basing himself on Nu 23[19] said 'If a man say—I am God, he lies; I am son of man (*Ben-Adam*), he will finally repent it; I ascend to heaven, he will not prove it.' This he said in Hebrew (and not in his native Aramaic), to make obvious his play on Nu 29[19]; it is likely directed against Jesus. One cannot argue that because Abbahu said *Ben-Adam* that Jesus called Himself *Ben-Adam*. Targ. Pseudo-Jonathan (Nu 23[19]) translates *Ben-Adam* by *Bar-Nash*; although that Targum may not be contemporaneous with Abbahu, he as a Palestinian would know that Aramaic speaking Palestinians would understand *Ben-Adam* as equivalent to *Bar-Nash*.

It is almost certain that Jesus called Himself *Bar-Nash* or *Bar-Nasha*. Even if Dalman's assertion[1] that *Bar-Enasha* 'did not properly belong to the common language of the Palestinian Jews as a term for "man," but was characteristic rather of the elevated diction of poetry and prophecy'[2] were correct, the occurrence of the expression in Dn 7[13] would sanction Jesus' use of it as a title. Dalman's assertion rests on his assumption that Targ. Onkelos represents early Palestinian Aramaic. Onkelos is neither Palestinian nor early, but represents an artificial Babylonian dialect.[3] That *Bar-Nash* could be used for 'anyone' or 'a man' in early Palestinian Aramaic is shown clearly in the Geniza fragments of the Palestinian Pentateuch Targum,[4] for in Gn 4[14] *Bar-Nash* is used for 'anyone'[5] while in Gn 9[5-6] *Bar-Nasha* (thrice) and *Bar-Nash* (twice) alike translate *Ha-Adam* man.

In 4 Ezra the man from the sea 'flying with the clouds of heaven' (13[3f.]) 'whom the Most High is keeping many ages' (*v.*[25. 26]) and in the Sibyllines the 'blessed man from the plains of heaven' (Bk. v. 414 ff.) would be in Aramaic *Bar-Nash* (man or son of man). In these sources their heavenly man (=son of man) is the Messiah. Both are influenced by Dn 7[13]: the Sibylline Blessed Man has 'the sceptre in his hand which God has committed to his clasp, and he has won dominion over all' (cf. Dn 7[14]); 4 Ezra's Man that came out of the sea, not only flies with the clouds of Heaven but cut out a great mountain (*ib.* 13[7])[6]; he will be victorious against the heathen assailants, and has power 'to order the survivors' (*ib. v.* [26]): in short, dominion and judgment are his also from God.

The Sibyllines here, and 4 Ezra are post-Christian, but the Similitudes of Enoch are probably almost a century B.C. The evidence in the Similitudes (1 En 37–71) on 'the Son of man,' his functions and status, has recently been depreciated. Perhaps Charles was substantially correct in stressing the importance of 1 Enoch for our understanding of Jesus' use of the term. 1 Enoch is no mere hotch-potch; it has a system, albeit of its own. Charles[7] has noted its five-fold division, a well-known Jewish device. 1 Enoch is as coherent as the Hebrew 3 Enoch (ed. Odeberg). Odeberg argues cogently (*ib.*, 41) that 'the time of composition or redaction of 3 Enoch seems to be the latter half of the third century (A.D.).' His impressive citations of ideas and expressions of 1 Enoch which recur in 3 Enoch[8] bear out his contention that 1 Enoch must have lain before the 3 Enoch circle much in the same form—with regard to composition—as is preserved to us, *i.e.* there is no trace of separate existence of the different parts of 1 Enoch at the time of 3 Enoch.'[9] 1 En 14[18f.] and 71[7f.] furnish descriptions of God's throne derived from Ezk 1 and Dn 7. But 1 Enoch's description of the throne is more developed; the very wheels (אופנים) of Ezk 1 have become the angels called Ophannim (1 En 61[10] 71[7]). Similarly in 3 Enoch the wheels (גלגלים) Ezk 10 and Dn 7 become the angels Galgalim. The development is significant. Ben Sira (*c.* 200 B.C.) 49[8] wrote 'Ezekiel described the different beings of the chariot.' This is the earliest use of the technical term 'chariot' applied to God's throne (Ezk 1) as a sacred mystery.[10] The study of the heavenly chariot (*Merkabah*) became important later in Jewish theodicy, dealing in pictorial hypostases instead of in abstract concepts with the problem of Divine government. In 1 and 3 Enoch alike the descriptions of the throne are essential as these books contain the lore of the chariot-throne. The Similitudes (1 En 37–71) (even excepting the so-called Noahidic 'interpolations') include cosmic geography, the secrets of the elements and the angelic powers over them; these are not irrelevant as they formed part of the *Maase-Merkabah* (cf. *T.B. Hag.* 13 ff.); God on His throne is the apex of ascending powers; whatever may be appearances on earth He is in control on high. Judgment will come. This last is based on Dn 7[9ff.] which became part of *Merkabah* mysticism (cf. *T.B. Hag.* 14a); Akiba (*d.* A.D. 132 or 135) apparently regarded Daniel's 'son of man' as agent of God's judgment (so also 1 En 46[4ff.]), nay went further and identified him and the Davidic Messiah. For another reason detailed knowledge of the outskirts of God's ways was an integral part of the study of the mystics who

[1] *The Words of Jesus*, 256. [2] See also *ib.*, 237.
[3] Cf. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, 129 ff.
[4] Published in *Massoreten des Westens*, ii.: *Fragmente des Palästinischen Pentateuch-Targums*, 7, 31; on its importance see *The Cairo Geniza*, 125–132, esp. 129.
[5] לֵית־אֶפְשַׁר לְבַרְנָשׁ. [6] Cf. Dn 2[45].
[7] *The Book of Enoch*,[2] p. lxiv. [8] *Ib.*, 43–51.
[9] Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, ii. 281.
[10] *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, i. 505.

sought this reassuring vision of God enthroned; it was in order to avoid in their cosmic wanderings calling anything by its wrong name; *e.g.* Akiba (*T.B. Hag.* 14b) warned his fellow mystics against mistaking the transparent marble near God's throne for water; these very surroundings of the throne are described in 1 En 14^{10-18} and 71^{5-11} (an argument for the Jewish origin of even this latter passage). 1 Enoch's connexion with the *Merkabah* mysticism emphasizes its Jewish origin.

Enoch in its entirety survives only in Ethiopic. Since there are three [1] different Ethiopic renderings of 'son of man' in 1 Enoch, their authenticity has been challenged; these variations are probably to be explained as due to different translators; an analogy is offered by the different renderings of ὁ υἱος του ἀγθρωπου in both the Curetonian and the Sinaitic Syriac N.T.

The context of none of the 'son of man' passages points to Christian interpolations. We have absolutely nothing on the suffering and death of the 'son of man'; a Christian interpolator would surely have attempted to harmonize the Enochic teaching on the 'son of man' with the life and teaching of Jesus. What Christian interpolator would have identified Enoch with the 'son of man,' as is done in ch. 71? [2] In 1 Enoch 'son of man' is a title apparently messianic; [3] the demonstrative preceding the title is also found with Divine titles 'Lord of Spirits,' and 'Head of Days' and therefore Wellhausen's argument therefrom that 'son of man' is not in Enoch already titular, is inadmissible.[4]

Even supposing the 'son of man' passages were interpolations one would be left with the 'Elect One' passages which describe a being with similar functions and attributes except pre-existence. Both 'son of man' (52^4) and the 'Elect One' (48^{10}) are called 'His Anointed' (Messiah).[5]

That the 'Elect One' can be explained as a collective expression for righteous Israel is, despite Messel, unconvincing; there is a clear distinction between 'Mine Elect One' and 'Mine Elect Ones,' *e.g.* 1 En $45^{3.4}$. Though the Danielic title 'Head of Days' for God appears only along with the 'son of man' and not with the 'Elect One' [6] yet the throne of glory of the 'Elect One' (45^3 55^4 $62^{1.2}$) [7] and the forensic functions assigned him, recall Dn 7^{13} as do the 'son of man' passages.

Enoch in Rabbinic literature is often identified with Metatron (cf. Targ. Pseudo-Jonathon Gn 5^{24}) 'he (Enoch) was withdrawn and ascended to the firmament by the Word before the Lord and his name was called Metatron the great Scribe.' [8] In *T.B. Hag.* 15a, Metatron records the merits of Israel; Lev. R. 34^8 assigns such scribal functions to Elijah and the King Messiah. The Similitudes (1 En 37–71) identify 'son of man' with 'His Anointed' and 'son of man' with Enoch (ch. 71). Did Rabbinic sources ever identify Metatron-Enoch with *Bar-Nash* and the Messiah? In 3 Enoch Metatron-Enoch is not the Messiah, nor called 'son of man,' but the attributes of 'Son of Man-Elect One' are his (cf. 1 En 46 with 3 En 48c[9]); once he is actually called 'Elect One,' 3 En 6^3.[9]

Metatron is he 'whose name is like his master's' (*T.B. Sanh.* 38b). Not only does the numerical value of the name Metatron equal Shaddai,[10] but Metatron is called 'the lesser Yahweh' [11] and Yehoel-Yah, and Yehoel.[12] Indeed he was once mistaken for God because like the Enochic 'Son of Man-Elect One' he sits on a throne. Acher (Elisha ben Abuya, *c.* A.D. 70–140) when he attained the Chariot vision saw Metatron and said 'Are there perhaps two first principles?'

Interesting parallels to the glorification of the son of man' by God in 1 En $46^{3.4}$ are found in Midr. Psalms 21 where God crowns King Messiah with His own crown of fine gold (cf. also Ex. R., ch. 8^1), clothes him in His own robes of glory and majesty (cf. also Num. R. 14^3 15^{13}) and calls him by His own name 'The Lord is our righteousness' (Jer 23^6). This last reminds us of 1 En 46^3, 'This is the Son of Man who hath righteousness.' 1 En 46^3 and Num. R. 13^{11} endow the 'Elect One' and

[1] For 'son of man'—*Walda Sab'e* (=בר נשׁא); *Walda B'Eshi* (ברה רנבר) and *Walda 'Eguali 'Emahijaw*. This last in Ethiopic O.T. translates *Ben-Adam* (Ps $80^{17(18)}$, Ezk 2^1, etc.) and *Bar-Enash* (Dn 7^{13}); so Charles, *ib.*, 86. Messel (Beihefte 35 *Z.D.A.W.*, pp. 6, 7), assuming that the translator of 1 Enoch was consistent, and since *Walda B'Eshi* and *Walda 'Eguali 'Emahijaw* do not occur before chs. 62–71, argues they are not genuine; nevertheless chs. $46^{2ff.}$ and 48^2 are left.

[2] Charles had no justification for altering the text from the second person to the third where Enoch is greeted and proclaimed as the 'son of man.' Chs. 70 and 71 are the climax of the Similitudes.

[3] Though having no connexion with a Davidic earthly Messiah.

[4] Cf. Charles, *ib.*, 86 f.

[5] Charles, *ib.*, 65, follows Beer in separating throughout the Similitudes 'son of man' and 'Elect One' sources. I am not convinced that the 'Elect One' and 'son of man' passages are from different sources.

[6] The Divine title 'Father of Spirits' appears alike in 'son of man' and 'Elect One' passages.

[7] Similarly of 'son of man,' 62^5 $69^{27.29}$.

[8] Enoch is 'scribe of righteous' (1 En 15^1). On 'The origin of the word Metatron,' cf. Odeberg, *ib.*, 125–146, a valuable discussion of possible etymologies.

[9] Odeberg (cf. *ib.*, 146) considers the omission of messianic character in Metatron and lack of identification of him with Dn 7^{13} in 3 Enoch as a deliberate suppression of such features.

[10] Cf. Rashi, Ex 23^{21}. Metatron is sometimes identified with Michael (He who is like God [Num. R. 2^{10}]) Tanhuma (Buber) 1, 165.

[11] 3 En 12^5, 48c[7], 48D[1]; cf. Apoc. Moses 43^5.

[12] Cf. Yaoel or Yehoel, Apoc. Abraham, chs. 10, 12.

the Messiah respectively with identical qualities; the Biblical authority in each case being Is 11^2.

The pre-existence of the 'son of man' is taught in the Similitudes (1 En $48^{2.3.6}$); it is not just that his name existed before creation ($v.^3$)[1] which is taught of the Messiah in Gn. R. 1^4, or that he exists hidden somewhere in this world, as at the gates of Rome (cf. Ex. R. 1^{26}) ready to be revealed; but his actual pre-existence with God in heaven is taught. That such a view was not unknown to the Rabbis appears from Lev. R. 14^1, also Gn. R. 2^4. Resh Lakish (A.D. 200–275) explained Gn 1^2 '"the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters" is the spirit of King Messiah.' The same tradition appears in Pesikta R, p. 152b, adding that 'from the beginning of the creation of the world the King Messiah was born, for he came up in the thought (of God) before the world was created.' Gn. R. 2^4 in Theodor's edition identified the Spirit of God, not with the spirit of the Messiah, but with the spirit of Adam (The First Man); so, too, does Gn. R. 8^1; nevertheless the Messianic text Is 11^2 is applied to him, as in Pesikta R, 152b to the Messiah. It appears from the variants that the spirit of Adam and the spirit of the Messiah could be confused or regarded as identical.[2]

[1] To the Semite 'name' is inextricably bound up with personality however.

[2] Cf. The Clementine Homilies 3^{20} where their identity is asserted: it is there claimed that 'He has changed His form and His name from the beginning of the world, and so appeared again and again in the world.' Presumably in the Enoch circle, Enoch could thus be understood as the pre-existent Son of Man. On the First Man see *J.E.* vol. i., 'Adam Kadmon.'

When we remember that *Bar-Nash* is used in the early Palestinian Targum for *Adam* man, that the corresponding figure to the Enochic 'Son of Man' (=Messiah) in 4 Ezra is the heavenly man, that in the Midrash the spirit of Adam and the spirit of Messiah are apparently identical, there seems little reason not to believe that in some quarters *Bar-Nash* was a 'messianic' title. The Targum on Is 52^{13}–53^{12} like Ruth R. 5^6 identifies the Servant of the Lord with the Messiah. In 3 Enoch, Metatron-Enoch, the counterpart of 1 Enoch's son of man, is called *Ebed* or My Servant.[3] Could this point to an identification of the son of man and the Servant of Yahweh earlier than 3 Enoch? But whether it was earlier than Jesus or not, it was He who showed the actual implications of the son of man who was also Suffering Servant. Burkitt[4] held that some of Jesus' teaching is in the nature of a Midrash on such teaching as in 1 Enoch. Those with the Enochic teaching of the son of man in their minds would find it as difficult to recognize in Jesus of Nazareth the heavenly son of man, as others to see in him the King Messiah. Yet it was probably such hopes[5] as theirs He took and in fulfilling them, transformed them. 'Behold I make all things new.'

[3] 1^4 10^3 $48c^1$, etc. In Hekhaloth R. 26^8 'Servant of Yahweh.'

[4] *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, 21 f.

[5] The Rabbinic material cited cannot be dated absolutely; the sources are all post-Christian. Yet they probably represent earlier ideas; certainly they were not borrowed from Christianity.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Harvest.

By the Reverend David Smith, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancashire.

'The harvest truly is plenteous.'—Mt 9^{37}.

Have you ever played that fascinating game of taking one word and from it making as many other words as you possibly can? I have been trying it with the word, 'Harvest.' I wonder how many words you can make with the seven letters, H A R V E S T? I stopped when I had made thirty, but I expect you will do better. Some of my words were: have, tea, ate, tear, rate, rash, vest, vast, etc. etc. Now see what you can do. I was surprised not only with the number of words I could make, but more so with the words really appropriate to the Harvest.

I have the letters here—let us do a little re-arranging—and look at a few of the words.

(1) Take five of your letters, and you can make the word *E A R T H*. Without the earth there would be no harvest, for it is the source of all our supply. The Bible says, 'while the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest . . . shall not cease.' God has made the earth to yield all manner of marvellous things, and to provide for the needs of His children. Year by year, men gather the amazing variety of the earth's gifts. They are beyond our telling and are more than sufficient for the needs of all God's people. Yes, E A R T H must be our first word—for there is the beginning of harvest, and as we make it, let us thank God for all His goodness.

(2) Our second word is made by taking away the first letter, 'H,' and then bringing the last two letters to the front. Then you will find we have made the word *S T A R V E*. This is rather a sad word, but we can't leave it out, because in a world where God has so richly provided, there are many who have less than enough to eat. That is true in Europe. I have two friends who are teachers in Germany and they talk of boys and girls for whom a glass of milk is a very rare luxury. And that is by no means the only thing

they are lacking. It makes one's heart sick and sad to realize that in God's good earth there are little folk who are starving. Thank God for all the generous-hearted people who are doing what they can to help the hungry and the needy.

And that brings me to my third word from Harvest. How can we help to chase away some of the sadness in the world? How can we change the grim word 'STARVE' into something lovelier? I'll tell you. Take away the letters 'T' and 'V' and in the place of 'T' put the letter 'H.' Now what is our Harvest word?

(3) *SHARE*. That is the secret. If we are to use God's gifts of Harvest as He intended, then we must learn to share with others. The rich yield of earth's bounty is not just for you and me—it is for all. It doesn't mean that we should all have exactly the same—but it does mean that no child of God, whatever its race or colour, need go hungry. God has provided enough and to spare, but we have not learned how to share. What then is wrong? When I was playing about with my seven Harvest letters I somehow found them in the following formation—T R A E H. I looked and looked and then I saw in a flash that it was really *H E A R T* upside down—and that is how I found my fourth word. This seemed to me to be perhaps the most important word. If we are to learn how to use the Harvest gifts as God desires; if we are to learn how to share so that none need starve, then our heart must be right side up. I asked myself why there were people willing to share with others—perhaps even their scanty rations. Why some of the members of my church, and the boys and girls in my Sunday school had sent parcels of food and clothing to children of another country? The answer was that their hearts were right and that they had been made right by Jesus Christ. He is the only one who can make our hearts loving and kind. I like that picture of our Lord feeding the great crowd of people. First of all accepting the barley loaves and fishes brought by a young lad, then blessing and distributing the food to the multitude. The amazing thing was that all were satisfied. I think it was so because a loving heart cared for all the people, and loving hands broke and gave the bread and fishes.

How many words did you make out of H A R V E S T? I still think the important ones are—E A R T H, S T A R V E, S H A R E, H E A R T.

Outstanding Kindness.

By the Reverend G. M. George, Oldhall, Paisley.

'A cup of cold water only.'—Mt 10^{42}.

Charles Kingsley wrote *The Water-Babies* and *Westward Ho!*; but his younger brother Henry wrote good stories too. In one of them there was an old man, wicked and hard of heart. He was ill, and getting blind; but even so, his own son tricked him and deceived him time after time, and the father was so angry that he refused to have anything more to do with his son. Just before he died the old man was thinking of all the unkindness that had been shown to him, when he remembered one kind deed that some one had done; and he decided to leave two hundred pounds to the man who had done it, though he might have been his enemy. That one little kind action stood out in his mind in his last moments.

Jesus often spoke about kindness, and one of the things He said was that even a cup of cold water given in love is a very big thing indeed. Amid all the unkindness there is in the world it stands out as something different. It helps to turn men's hearts to love and goodness. And even if we feel we can't do big things, we can do outstanding things, in the spirit of Jesus Christ.

Some stories from the time of war teach us the same lesson. There was a man who belonged to the French Resistance Movement who was put in prison by the Germans, and treated very badly. They tried to get him to betray his friends. They cooped him in a narrow cell, and only allowed him a little time each day to read his Bible. He got very little to eat. But one day, one of the German soldiers guarding the prison stole in very quietly, and stretched out his hand to offer a plate of cakes and apples. The Frenchman was taken aback with surprise at the unexpected kindness. 'Whatever is this?' he asked. 'What made you bring me this'? 'I am a Christian, too,' said the German soldier.

Or, again, take this story from the other side of the world. Four British soldiers had been wounded by the Japanese, and were lying helpless by the roadside, when two or three Japs came along. The Britishers were wondering what was going to happen to them, for they knew how cruel some of the Japs could be. But these came forward kindly. They spoke English, and they offered help. 'We are Christians ourselves,' they said, 'and we hate war.' So, amidst all the horror of battle, amidst all the cruelty of men, that little act of Christian kindness stood out, and the story of it has been heard by thousands of people in other parts of the world.

If, then, you and I are serving Jesus Christ, we do not need to look for some imposing way of showing off. Jesus gives power to the smallest acts of kindness and helpfulness. There may be some one in school beside us, or in the street where we live, who finds the world a hard and cruel place. One kind word from us, one little deed of love, will shine for him like a light of hope and happiness in the dark. Let us speak that kind word, let us do that good deed, for Christ's sake.

The Christian Year.

Twelfth Sunday after Trinity.

The Time is Short.

By the Reverend N. H. G. Robinson, B.D., D.Litt., Fraserburgh.

'But this I say, brethren, the time is short.'—1 Co 7^{29}.

This seventh chapter of Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthian Christians must be one of the most

remarkable chapters which ever came from the Apostle's pen. It is entirely concerned to deal with a certain class of moral and spiritual problems, which had apparently become a burden to the consciences of contemporary Christians, that type of problem, namely, which had to do with the Christian attitude to marriage. Should a Christian marry at all? What should a Christian do about the possibility of marrying for a second time? How should a Christian conduct himself within the marriage bond? What, especially, should a Christian's attitude be towards an unbelieving spouse? These and possibly other practical questions had begun to trouble the minds and hearts of some Corinthian Christians; and in this chapter Paul sets himself to deal with the subject and to offer, as far as he can, some guidance on such a complicated matter. But the surprising thing is this, that Paul's remarks in this chapter, in dealing with this matter, have very noticeably a quality which one does not usually find in anything that the Apostle has to say, for if you read through the passage you will find that his whole treatment of the subject is characterized by a persistent hesitancy. The Apostle obviously and confessedly feels that in dealing with this matter he is not at all upon firm ground. At one time we find him saying that on this matter it is he who speaks and not the Lord. On another question he confesses that he has no commandment of the Lord; yet I give, he adds, my own judgment as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful. On still another occasion he acknowledges that the advice he has to offer is just his own judgment on the matter; although, he adds, I think also that I have the spirit of God. Almost from the beginning to the end of the chapter, you see, in his entire treatment of this subject, Paul is plainly feeling his way, going warily, unsure of himself, yet seeking for the benefit of those perplexed Christians in Corinth, seeking all the time to apply his understanding of the Christian gospel to the matters which have been brought to his notice.

Moreover, Paul's uncertainty and hesitancy on these questions is not surprising. We can understand it and commend it, when we recall that as a matter of fact Paul's conclusions and decisions have not stood the test of time, but have been largely cast aside by the increasing insight of the Christian consciousness. For example, one of Paul's opinions was that the unmarried state is necessarily and spiritually better than the married; but few people nowadays would agree that the matter can be put as simply and dogmatically as that. Rather it seems saner and more Christian to regard each estate as involving its own vocation, its own duties and responsibilities, and *not* to say that one is always to be preferred above the other. And, as a matter of fact, that is more or less the position which the Christian consciousness has favoured in departing from the findings of the Apostle Paul.

Indeed we can see why it was that Paul was led astray on these questions. For one thing, he lived in the very earliest days of the Christian era, and during his lifetime, although there were of course many Christian converts, Christian families must have been comparatively few and far between. Paul's experience of the Christian family must have been restricted and narrow in the greatest degree; and therefore the great Apostle was deprived of the opportunity of appreciating the high value of the Christian family, and of understanding its almost central place in the wise purposes of God. Then, in the second place, the Apostle may have shared quite a common opinion of those early days, the opinion that the end of all things was at hand and that men should live in constant expectation of an imminent consummation. If that was the Apostle's belief it was only natural and quite consistent that he should pay scant heed to the rich potentialities of Christian marriage and the Christian family. Indeed, if we examine carefully this seventh chapter of his First Corinthian Epistle, we find that amid all its hesitations and uncertainties and qualifications there is one point at which the old Paul makes his appearance, with the old note of authority in his voice, his feet patently feeling the ground firmer underfoot, and his spirit jumping forward to give a lead confidently and with conviction to his perplexed brethren. It is the point at which our text is to be found—'But this I say, brethren, the time is short: it remaineth, that both they that have wives be as though they had none; and they that weep, as though they wept not; and they that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and they that buy, as though they possessed not; and they that use this world, as not abusing it: for the fashion of this world passeth away.' You see the change, don't you? The hesitation has gone; the qualified and tentative expressions have disappeared; the honest and open uncertainties have fallen behind. A new note of authority has crept in; the Apostle's feet are treading on far firmer ground—But this I say, brethren, the time is short; let him that useth this world in any way be as him that abuseth it not, for the fashion of this world passeth away.

But, perhaps you say, Paul was wrong; although he was certain and spoke with the old note of authority, he was yet mistaken, for the time was not short, the end was not at hand, and even yet the world continues almost two thousand years after the Apostle lived and died. And, of course, all that is true. He was wrong in expecting a quick end to all things; and yet he was right, he had grasped the urgency of the Christian gospel and the Christian calling, for the gospel and calling of Christ are addressed to every creature with extreme urgency no matter how long the world may continue. Paul was right after all—the time *was* indubitably short, let the world continue as long as God cared. It was as if he said to these Corinthian Christians something like this: 'There you are. I have given you what seems to me the application of Christ's gospel to those problems of marriage with which you have been perturbed; I have given you the application as best I can; it is my considered judgment and

opinion on these matters, my verdict if you like, not God's, although in all I have said I have tried to interpret to you the mind of God and no other. But look, whether you accept my guidance or not, no matter in what state you may find yourself at present, married or unmarried, in joy or sorrow, buying or selling, wherever you are, whatever you may be doing, remember the time is short, the gospel and will of Christ are addressed to you *now* just where you are, for the fashion of this world passeth away. The time is short, all time is short, it has a limit and an end; and the only real time is the present, to-morrow never comes, *now* is the accepted time, *now* is the day of salvation. Therefore serve the Lord to-day, fulfil your Christian calling now, where you are, as you are. Christ is Lord to-day and not to-morrow, His purpose for you is a purpose for to-day with all its troubles and perplexities and ordinary everyday things, Christ's purpose for you is a purpose for to-day, not just a purpose for some unknown or only half-seen morrow.'

So Paul spoke in effect to those Corinthian Christians long ago; and of course Paul was dead right. The long history of the world does not alter the matter in the least. It is completely irrelevant, the source only of a fatal delusion. Look at it this way. Our job is to serve the Eternal God amid the changing scenes of time. But time is always changing and always has an end; the fashion of this world passeth away; and there is only one little piece of time in which Eternity comes near enough to be served, and that is neither yesterday nor to-morrow, it is to-day, now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation. You can only serve the Eternal God in time to-day; to-morrow is too late, it is not in time, it never comes.

Have you grasped that point? There are many people who somehow believe that the truth lies with Christianity; and yet they postpone coming to terms with it, but although they do not know it they are deluding themselves. It is not just that a postponed situation inevitably alters and worsens, although that certainly is true. It is not just that evil habits allowed a longer lease of life invariably become stronger and harder to control, although that also is true. It is not just that putting off till to-morrow is foolish since for us there may be no to-morrow after all, although once again that is true. No, in the procrastinating outlook there is a far more present danger and a far more fatal delusion than in any of these things. To say, 'To-morrow, to-morrow, always to-morrow' is to put a lie in the place of the truth. It is to say, 'Christ will be Lord to-morrow, or Christ will rise to-morrow'; but it is false, for Christ is alive to-day and Christ is Lord of the present. He reigns eternally and He reigns in time, not just yesterday nor to-morrow, but to-day, in the short fleeting present, the only part of time for us which is alive and able to accept His Lordship. Therefore this I say, brethren, the time is short; and it remaineth that they who use this world use it as they who abuse it not, for the fashion of this world passeth away.

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Spiritual Insight.

BY PROFESSOR THE REVEREND HAROLD ROBERTS, M.A., PH.D., RICHMOND.

'Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see.'—Lk 10^{23}.

The supreme event of history had happened. Christ, the Son of God and Lord of life, had come and the Kingdom of God had been inaugurated on earth. Prophets and kings had yearned for the day when God's kingly Rule would be manifested. What for them was an object of faith and hope was now a present reality. Jesus came into Galilee, saying, 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel.' The signs that the Kingdom of God had come were there for men to see. On every hand the powers of the eternal world were breaking into human life. The miracles of Jesus were not 'works of wonder.' They were signs that the Kingdom had drawn near. The words which Christ spoke were the words of God. By speech and action He proclaimed the good news which meant nothing less than that God Himself had visited and redeemed His people. The disciples who saw the unmistakable signs of the Kingdom were indeed to be envied. Prophets and kings were held in high veneration but here were simple men who had witnessed an event for which the righteous men of old could only pray in expectant hope. Those, therefore, who were least in the new order which had dawned were greater than prophets and kings. Eternity and time had met in Jesus Christ. The secret of history had been revealed and the redemptive powers of the Kingdom were abroad. 'Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see.'

Not many, however, perceived that God was in Christ disclosing and fulfilling His eternal purpose. We often imagine that if only we to-day could converse with our Lord, see Him with the physical eye, walk with Him and sup with Him, our faith would be immeasurably strengthened. To see the things which His disciples saw would, we sometimes like to think, banish unbelief and destroy its power. How easily we forget that, when our Lord departed from the earth, He left behind Him but a very small company of men and women—and perhaps children—upon whose love He could count. In the course of His ministry it was given to many to see His marvellous works, but few were moved to repentance. They gave their verdict on His life by conspiring to put Him to death. 'Eyes have they but they see not.' Of course, they saw His marvellous works but they did not discern their meaning. They heard His words but they were not for them the words of the living God. They were confronted by the highest and holiest in human life but remained unmoved.

How do we account for the fact that with painfully few exceptions our Lord's contemporaries failed to discern the presence and power of God in His life, teaching, and work? The answer is not

far to seek. They lacked spiritual insight. That is, they failed to lay themselves open to the reality of God as it was unveiled before their eyes in Christ. Of course, they knew that there was something unusual about the Galilean preacher. Even His enemies could not regard Him as commonplace. His teaching and His miracles challenged their attention. Since, however, they could not fit Him into their own preconceived schemes, they dismissed Him as a fanatic or a visionary. What seemed, at first sight, mysterious was susceptible of a naturalistic explanation. Hence, they were quite unresponsive to the mighty acts of God which were being enacted around them. For the same reason they were unable to estimate aright the meaning of the events that were taking place in the world of their day or to know the things that belonged to their peace. They had formed the habit of relating everything that happened to themselves and of converting Divine truth into what they wished to believe. We speak of their sin as hypocrisy. What is hypocrisy? It is surely not a failure to make our conduct consistent with our ideals. If, indeed, our conduct were in complete harmony with our ideals, we should do well to ask ourselves whether our ideals were not in need of revision. The essence of hypocrisy is to escape from the impact of truth and to manipulate conscience in our own interests. It is to refuse to allow truth to have its way with us so that it may bear its witness without regard to our dignity or pride. The nemesis of trifling with the sacredness of truth is spiritual blindness. We find ourselves in a world from which moral reality has departed.

To-day, Christians are perplexed by the attitude of many towards the Christian Faith. Those who seek to commend the gospel of God to the 'outsider' often meet with a disappointing response. Much energy is expended on the diagnosis of the present religious situation and the apparent indifference of the majority of our contemporaries to a religious appeal. We are sometimes told that the impoverished personal and social witness of the Church is a stumbling-block in the way of Christian advance. Professing Christians are not what they ought to be and the quality of their thought and life hardly commends the gospel that is offered. Or, again, we are informed that Christianity needs to be restated in intelligible language and that there should be a renewed effort to relate Christianity to the practical needs of ordinary men and women. There may be a great deal of truth in these and kindred observations which are being constantly repeated within and without the Church. What we tend to forget is that the Rule of God was perfectly manifested in Christ and He was despised and rejected of men. Those who bear the name of Christ too frequently fail to display the virtues of their Lord but there is no ground for the facile assumption that the Christian character has only to be set forth in its true nature to win the allegiance of men. Much still needs to be done by way of interpreting the Christian Faith in relation to contemporary thought. Are we, however, to conclude that when Christianity has been translated into terms understood of the people there will be an immediate response? Every evangelist knows that the difficulties with which he has to contend lie deeper than language. Provided he contents himself with a discussion of the social and economic implications of the gospel, he can be assured of a fair hearing. But as soon as he reminds his audience that the primary question is not whether the gospel is relevant to our problems but whether our way of life is relevant to the gospel, interest seems to flag and he is conscious of unmistakable resistance to his message. Our age appears to be losing the capacity to read God's meaning in Christ and in human life as a whole. Herein lies the tragedy of the modern world.

The Kingdom of God has come with Christ but it can only become a reality in our lives in so far as it commends itself to our mind and conscience. Our chief need to-day is the cultivation of spiritual insight so that we may see God's Rule active in Christ and, in the light of that revelation, trace its operation over the whole breadth of our experience. Such insight means a willingness to lay ourselves open to God at every level—thought, feeling, and will. It is sustained by constant companionship with Christ, by relating every event to God's purpose, by sharing in the fellowship of the sufferings of Christ and responding to the call of Christ as it comes to us in daily life. Spiritual insight cannot be coerced but it can be awakened and trained. It is the gift of the Holy Spirit who is active everywhere, seeking to reconcile men and women to the meaning which our Lord Himself put into human life. The Church is the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. Its supreme task is to multiply the number of those who have encountered God Himself in Christ and who have gladly and freely consecrated their insight to the claims of the Divine Rule.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Harvest Truths.

BY THE REVEREND G. W. H. LOUDON, B.D., S.T.M., CALLANDER.

'And herein is that saying true, One soweth, and another reapeth.'—Jn 4^{37}.

It was of the spiritual harvest that Jesus was thinking when He quoted this proverb to His friends. In His use of it, the whole physical action of sowing and of reaping, together with the whole physical process of germination and growth that lay between these two extremes—all this is secondary and subordinate to the spiritual truth which our Lord was concerned to express. But in another sense, and from another aspect, these physical things must always come first. They do exist in their own right; they must do so, before any thought of spiritual harvesting can be arrived at; and it is this aspect of them that will be considered here. For there are certain truths about these physical actions and processes which are worthy of remembrance; and the words of the

text may serve as a sufficient remembrancer of them.

1. Consider, then, in the first place what one can only call the *anonymous* nature of it all—'*One* soweth, and *another* reapeth.' No names are given—we would hardly expect them, after all, in a proverb; but somehow the very turn of the phrase contrives to suggest that in any case names are needless. If the sowing and the reaping are well done, it matters little who the one and another are who do them. They are the sower and the reaper; and that is, or should be, enough.

Our text does not say these things outright; but it does bring them to mind, it does encourage us to think in these terms, and along the lines that such terms suggest. Now that thinking can be either to good effect or bad. It may lead us to perceive the reason for this anonymity, this namelessness; or it may lead us so far away from that reason that we end up by throwing the whole thing upon one side and thinking of it no more.

That second result—the result which is the bad effect or outcome of our thought—comes whenever we let ourselves treat this anonymous work as we might treat an anonymous letter; that is, as something a man has not the courage or the desire to put his name to because he knows its worthlessness and falsity. For such a nameless one we have nothing but contempt; and it is easy to carry over this kind of disregard, and to apply it to the other anonymous work, where it does not properly belong. And that is what makes it so imperative for us all that we should face the matter honestly, and ask ourselves how we have thought of those who sow and those who reap. How often have we thought about them and what has been the *quality* of our thinking?

It is to be hoped that the answer to that question is an easy one—easy, that is, in so far as the satisfying of our conscience is concerned. But now let us turn to the other attitude towards this namelessness, and the right way of thinking concerning it; and indeed the main feature of it has been already expressed. 'If the sowing and the reaping are rightly done, it matters little who they are who do them'; for this is an occasion in which the workman is less important than the work.

That is something which cannot be said of every activity of man; for it is *not* every one of them that is concerned with the primal realities and with man's basic needs. We may recall the words of Thomas Carlyle, who expresses as well as may be what we want to say: 'Two men I honour, and no third. First . . . the toilworn Craftsman that with earth-made Implement laboriously conquers the Earth, and makes her man's . . . *thou* art in thy duty, be out of it who may; thou toilest for the altogether indispensable, for daily bread.' The altogether indispensable—that is the work of the sower and the reaper; that is the activity whose importance thrusts themselves into obscurity; and *so long as it is like that*, they may be content to have it so.

So long as it is like that—but it has *not* been like that over long periods of years in our history. Twice in our own generation the pressure of war has forced us back upon this truth; but each time we have been eager and swift to forget. If we succeed in forgetting this time, we may not be given another chance to remember. And what is it that we are being asked to remember, after all? It is not the well-being, or the physical comfort, or the prosperity, of those who sow and those who reap. That, indeed, may and ought to follow; but that is not the primary and basic matter. *That* is the earth itself, from which the crops must come: the farmlands of our country, whereon men work for the altogether indispensable, for daily bread. These things are the means by which our familiar prayer is fulfilled; and surely we must think highly of them, as of every other channel for the gifts of God? Surely we must show a due consideration and a fitting obedience to their needs and their demands?

2. 'One soweth, and another reapeth'; and between these two acts there lies the whole physical process of germination and growth. It is of these in particular that we must think when we come to consider the second truth that this text seems to suggest; and that is the truth of *indifference*.

It is not meant by that, that the text suggests indifference on the part of the sower or the reaper; far less that it recommends it on the part of those who benefit from their labour. What is meant is rather the indifference of the seed. The seed, if we may so express it, is not distressed by the fact that one man may sow and another profit from his sowing. The seed makes no inquiries into the character or qualities of the sower; the wheat asks nothing about the man by whom it is reaped. His politics do not matter: his morals do not matter: his religion does not matter—the seed cares for none of these things. It does not ask what his race or nationality is, and is not curious about the colour of his skin. These things do not affect it. Its purpose, its obedience, is to grow where it has been sown; and if sun and rain and earth and air do their part, the seed grows in indifference to all these other things.

Of course, it will be said that the seed cannot help doing so; it cannot do anything else. And that is the very point towards which our argument is aiming, that is what it seeks to emphasize. There is a little verse about our daily bread, which reminds us that—

> Back of the loaf is the snowy flour,
> Back of the flour, the mill,
> Back of the mill is the wheat, and the shower
> And the sun, *and the Father's will.*

And it is the will of the Father that the seed is doing when it grows in the way I have described—grows with a generosity that knows no differentiations and no dividing lines. It is only when the will of man enters into the action, and seeks to shape the pattern of events, that any such differentiation appears—it is then, and only then, that you get the setting-up of moral and political and racial and even religious 'means tests.'

Sometimes, it would appear, we in Britain are apt to think that that kind of thing only happens in other countries; that it is only in the countries of Eastern Europe, for example, that you have to belong to the right political party in order to get a bread-ticket. And in the more literal sense of things, perhaps that is true; but are we moving nearer to that kind of thing, or farther away from it? And what is perhaps a more important question—how *would* we react if something like that did come into force here? How would we react if we knew that we were on the right side of the dividing line—that whatever might happen to others, we at least should not lack for bread?

That is a question which cannot be left unanswered. The problems of the world's affairs to-day are complex and intricate, and perplexing to the ordinary man; but this much is clear, that the task of feeding the world—of supplying it with the indispensable of daily bread—is one of the biggest problems of all. That means that sooner or later we may have to face the answering of this question *in action*; and it would be well to have thought on our answer in advance. And while we do so, let us not forget the indifference of the seed, which grows in obedience to the Father's will—the same Father who makes His sun to shine alike on the just and the unjust, and sends His rain alike upon the evil and the good.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Rest in Weariness.

BY THE REVEREND R. LEONARD SMALL, M.A., CRAMOND.

'He restoreth my soul.'—Ps 23^3.

Of all the familiar and well-loved phrases of this Psalm, engraven as they are upon the stuff of life itself, few can speak more directly and compellingly than this to the heart of our present need. The prevailing mood to-day, however variously it may manifest itself, is essentially one of weariness. That weariness is probably largely physical, part of the reaction after the strain and stress of years of war; it may even be that, as many allege, deficiencies in diet have something to do with it. But it is much more obviously a weariness that goes deeper, a weariness of the mind and heart and spirit. The mind of the people has become dulled, it has been stirred so often by joy or sorrow, held tense in the strain of imminent danger, or relaxed into the unutterable relief of peril overpast, that it has lost its resiliency. The mind is sated with the sensational, the dramatic, the horrible, and can respond only sluggishly and fleetingly to even the most unusual stimulus. Anyone who makes any sort of appeal to the mind of the public, or can read at all his own dulled moods, is well aware of this type of weariness. And the heart and spirit are in it too, involved with mind and body in a downward-dragging lassitude, which goes far to explain the prevalent mood of cynicism and disillusionment. Hopes too often deferred have made sick the hearts of many, and it is still true that—

A merry heart goes all the day,
Your sad tires in a mile-a.

Worst, and most serious of all, is our spiritual weariness, which makes us unresponsive, even to God. It was said during the War, and we proved it to be true, that we can live on less if we have more to live for. When men, even Christian men, have lost the sense of any great purpose to live for and any great resources to live by, then their weariness is dire indeed. No wonder the spirit of defeatism has penetrated so deeply and widely that whether in Test Match cricket or Ryder Cup golf, in the struggle for better social relationships or for world peace, in the field of individual character or international reconstruction, we go on to the field expecting to be beaten! Our very weariness cries out, first and foremost, for the restoring of our souls.

How shall such a work of restoration be carried out with men and women in our situation? Underline the first four letters in the word 'restoreth,' and you have its beginning, for the first process must be one of *rest*.

'O rest in the Lord,' 'In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength, in returning and rest shall ye be saved,' 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest'—such is God's answer to our need; yet to rest, in a positive and helpful and healing sense, is not as simple as it may seem. There must be two complementary aspects to real rest. It must be rest *from* that which causes weariness. To 'fly far away, and be at rest,' to get away from it all, to escape and find sanctuary is a crying need, but to be still, to let go, to rest back, can be incredibly hard. During the Great War Lloyd George was asked how he managed to stand up to the strain of his manifold, grave responsibilities and he replied: 'When I shut a door, I shut a door.' He had cultivated the art of escaping completely from the burden, the worry, the strain. We have lost that knack and the loss is disastrous. To take a physical rest, and carry your worry, or your inward fretting with you is worse than useless; you were better working till you are too busy or too tired to have time to think. Truly to rest demands that we not only rest *from* our weariness, but rest *on* a power, and find a peace not our own. We cannot, indeed, we dare not, 'let go' unless we also 'let God.' The tired climber cannot rest unless he has a reliable guide to whom he is firmly linked by a stout rope, on which he will dare to rest. We can really rest only 'in the Lord,' and true rest is found only in so far as God will answer this, our prayer:

Drop Thy still dews of quietness,
Till all our strivings cease;
Take from our souls the strain and stress,
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace.

So the process of resting *from* weariness, by resting *on* God passes on to its next stage, symbol-

ized by regrouping the letters of the main word in the text '*re-storeth*.' Just as a plane sent out from an aircraft-carrier, having flown on a long patrol, must sooner or later search for that one spot promising a safe landing among the heaving seas, those few yards of tossing deck, since she cannot go on much longer without landing to re-fuel, so the inevitable exhaustion of our resources and reserves brings us back to God to be re-stored. Sometimes it is the sudden swift climb, calling for extra power all at once, sometimes it is just the droning on of daily routine duty, but either way our spiritual fuel becomes exhausted and we must go back to fill up again. There can be no more nerve-racking experience than for a pilot, running short of fuel, to lose touch with and fail to find the carrier. That is the real position with many of us to-day, we have come perilously near to the end of our resources, and we have lost or forgotten where to look for the source of renewed power. No man can maintain the spiritual glow if the batteries of faith and hope and love are allowed to get too far down without re-charging. None of us will ever mount up with wings to new heights of vision and service, such as the hour demands, or run the difficult race set before us in these post-war years, without growing weary in well-doing, and despairing of goodness and goodwill, or walk the dusty, dull path of daily duty without growing faint in body, mind, or spirit, unless he waits on the Lord who re-storeth our souls.

So we come to what must be the final result of all true rest for the Christian, a re-created life, centering round a *restored* soul. Rest must never be an end in itself, never merely and permanently a running away from life, rather must it be part of a healing process fitting us to face life again with victorious power. The climber rests back on the rope, not that he may be lowered safely to the easier ground below the ice-face, but that with recovered vigour, and nerves that are steadied, he may go stronger for the top. Even so, the hymn which opens with the longing for rest 'Let me to Thy bosom fly' ends with the triumphant assertion 'Thou of life the fountain art.' The only remedy for the weariness of our time lies in newness of life for the soul, new vigour, new hope, fresh resiliency, recovered stamina for the spirit. The German version of our text is suggestive: '*Er erquicket meine Seele*,' 'He quickens, puts life into my soul.' When an old picture is restored you may watch the process of cleaning being carried out, and you can see the loveliness of the old colours coming to life again. In the little Norman Church at Symington, in Ayrshire, some years ago the plastered ceiling was removed, and, little by little, the glory of the ancient timbered roof was laid bare, until all was restored to its original splendour. So God in Christ, by the slow, careful processes of true rest, can restore the soul.

Once during the War one saw the submarine *Thunderbolt*, formerly the *Thetis*, come back from weeks of patrol at sea. Her hull was foul, her engines needed overhaul, sundry repairs were overdue, and all her instruments needed to be 'trued.' Little by little she was edged into the floating-dock, and made fast. Her engines, that had toiled so long, were stilled, she no longer moved under her own power. Being made fast, she could let go. Then, slowly the dock rose out of the water, another power having taken charge, till she was lifted clear, where the work of repair, renewal, restoration could be carried out, and she be made fit again to sail the seas on her arduous tasks. So God's rest, God's re-storing, goes on, unto the restoring of our souls.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Enthusiasm of Self-Sacrifice.

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE JOHNSTONE JEFFREY, D.D., GLASGOW.

'Wherefore I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you.'—Eph 3^{13}.

There is a cynical saying of Rochefoucauld's that 'We have all strength enough to bear the troubles of other people.' But the mood that produced these words of the Apostle is anything but cynical. On the contrary, it glows with belief in human goodness and sensitiveness. A man, as Tennyson says, 'imputes himself'; that is to say that when generous feelings warm his own heart, he gives credit for similar feelings in the hearts of others. Here is Paul, a man whose career has been one long continuity of peril and privation. Yet such is the sublimity of his self-sacrifice that his one concern is, not that he himself should wilt under it, but that his converts should be unable to bear the sight. Wondrous self-effacement! It is the bloom on the Apostle's self-giving. It is the lily-work on the pillar of his massive strength.

And this is not the only instance of this sublime disregard of self. 'I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel.' What things? The brutal scourging, for example, in the dungeon at Philippi, that left his back a mass of blue weals. But 'None of these things moved him.' He could bear that, and ten times that, as long as Christ's work went gloriously forward. Here is a passion of self-offering that fills our minds with a kind of awe and puts our tepid witness to shame.

Let us consider some aspects of this shining allegiance, as this passage discloses them. Obviously it had but one source—*a passionate and personal devotion to Jesus Christ*. Paul is here seen, not as a mighty wrestler, exacting out of a disciplined will, the last ounce of self-denial for its own sake. The glory of it all is his utter lack of self-consciousness. He cannot help himself. Love always takes a greater toll out of a man than any outward compulsion. In the words of Robertson of Brighton, 'Self-sacrifice alone, bare and unrelieved, is ghastly, unnatural and dead. But self-sacrifice illuminated by love, is warmth and life. The *love* of Christ constraineth us.'

One inference from all this should be noted. The true Church consists of those and those alone who love the Lord Jesus Christ out of a pure heart, fervently. A man's formal creed, his chosen sect or denomination, his certificate of church membership, may mean much or little to himself and in themselves make little impression on the critical outsider. Christ's genuine disciples are those of every clime and condition who have been caught up into a devotion to Him that neither life nor death can sever. We simply cannot envisage a time when the spell of Jesus will fail to capture human hearts. None other has appeared on earth who has released and harnessed the sluices of man's allegiance, like Him. It is curious, yet significant, to hear a man of Lord Morley's cold and sceptical mind, relate the following incident. 'When Sir Richard Wallace's pictures were being exhibited at Bethnal Green, after people said that the workers had no soul for art and would not appreciate its treasures, a story is told of a woman, in poor clothes, gazing intently at a picture of the Infant Jesus in the arms of His mother and then exclaiming, "*Who would not try to be a good woman who had such a child as that?*"' Such has been the spell of Jesus throughout the ages and we cannot imagine an end to it. From the day when the rude Roman soldiers set the Cross in its socket and lifted up Jesus Christ there stretches the long procession of those who, with utter abandon, have counted the world well lost for His sake. 'Who follows in their train?'

Another facet of this shining self-sacrifice is revealed in this passage. It is Paul's glad acceptance of any outward condition, sure that wherever he might be and in whatsoever extremity of peril, he would be strengthened with might in the inner man. Here, then, is a royal law of Christian living. *The purer the motive, the surer the power.* Does it ever occur to us when our life seems at the mercy of some cynical imp of frustration that there must be some obvious reason for it? It is because our lives are oriented on self. The self-centred life is at war with God.

The love of God flows just as much
As that of ebbing self subsides.
Our hearts, their scantiness is such,
Bear not the conflicts of these rival tides.

Now the life sunk in God has its own frustrations. No man knew that better than Paul. But in the leading of God, to the man who could wait, these had a wonderful way of becoming channels of service. The closed door at Bithynia leads, in time, to the open door at Troas. Troubles abound —'But aye a heart aboon them a'.' That is the romance of every life that is done with self-seeking and is thirled to God's service. Well might his first biographer preface David Livingstone's life with the lines:

O little did my mither think
The day she cradled me
The lands that I would wander o'er
The death that I would dee.

Here is a man, with a man's weakness, 'following the gleam,' palpably, continuously and miraculously undergirded and sustained of God. Truly, the purer the motive, the surer the power. Have we faith to put this principle in practice? There is a saying of Charles Lamb's that has a strange, haunting appeal. 'He gave his heart to The Purifier.' Cannot we go aside at times and do likewise? Cannot we offer to God these hearts of ours and ask Him to wash them clean of 'miserable aims that end in self' and fill them with aspirations that begin, continue, and end in Christ? From such a purgation we would return to life, conquering and to conquer, often straitened in ourselves, never straitened in God, strengthened with might in the inner man, and into our life would come release, drive, direction and the joy that is its own security.

Lastly, the life that has its central fires in the love of Christ finds itself in *a glorious fellowship.* It finds itself lifted above life's shallows and set afloat on the broad stream of human usefulness. That is a glowing vision of Ezekiel's where he pictures the ever-deepening waters issuing from the door of the Temple—first to the ankles, then to the knees, then to the loins and at last waters to swim in—'and it shall come to pass, that every thing shall live whithersoever the river cometh.' Perhaps Paul had this vision in mind when he pictured a multitude of common folks, rooted and grounded in love and able to comprehend '*with all saints* what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge.'

It is restful to the mind amid the pessimism that abounds to contemplate the multitudes of people in every sphere of life whose careers are transfigured by love to Christ and are telling for goodness and for God. These are the Great Undecorated and the Great Unself-conscious. You find them in every congregation, in every home, in every place where men get together. It is good to regale our hearts with the thought of this mighty healing stream that flows through the annals of history, fertilizing whatever it touches. Russell Lowell has borne high tribute to this noble band:

One feast, of holy days the crest,
I, though no Churchman, love to keep,
All-Saints,—the unknown good that rest
In God's still memory folded deep;
The bravely dumb that did their deed,
And scorned to blot it with a name,
Men of the plain heroic breed,
That loved Heaven's silence more than fame.

Again, 'Who follows in their train?' Can we not, for the love of Christ, once for all, retire from the unholy scramble for honours, earned or unearned, that degrades public and sometimes ecclesiastical life, and, not letting our left hand know what our right is doing, be content to merge every gift we have of body, soul and spirit in the great work of Christian redemption? Could we but do it wholeheartedly, we would rediscover the open secret of great living—that he who loses his life for Christ's sake shall abundantly find it.

Literature.

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS

In 1940 Professor Edwin Lewis of Drew Theological Seminary published in the U.S.A. what was in effect a handbook of Christian Apologetics. This year the work has been published in Great Britain—*A Philosophy of the Christian Revelation* (Epworth Press; 15s. net). We bespeak for it a good welcome on this side of the Atlantic.

It is a book of various merits. The author's style, which is clear and vigorous, has matured and become more attractive; and it is embellished with quotations from modern poets, such as Shelley, Matthew Arnold, and Francis Thompson. His thought is consistent and coherent, and shows an excellent conception of how Christianity should be defended from the standpoint of a modern conservatism. If depth tends to be sacrificed to breadth, it gives the author the chance (which he has seized with good will) of many a reference to recent theological books, especially—curiously enough—as published in the Western hemisphere. Little or nothing of value and significance appears to have escaped his notice. Among those to whom he is indebted in Systematic Theology mention may be made of Barth and Brunner, John Oman and H. R. Mackintosh. (Not that he has actually handled all the books to which he refers; at any rate a good number of authors' names mis-spelled suggests that he has not.) Other merits of the book might be named; we only add that we like the note of urgency that it sounds.

As for Professor Lewis's standpoint it has been described above as 'modern' and 'conservative.' It is 'modern' in the sense that it shows an open mind to the results of modern historical and scientific studies in general and modern Biblical criticism in particular; it is 'conservative' in the sense that it upholds the Christian evangelical tradition as it has come down to us through St. Paul, St. Augustine, and Luther. Professor Lewis himself would probably describe his standpoint as one of 'genuine liberalism.'

This book bears witness to the fact that the question of Revelation has become central in modern Christian Apologetics. It is round the idea of Revelation that its contents are grouped. The first part of the book, 'Revelation and Record,' considers the claim respecting Revelation; in assessing the claim not only the Old and New Testaments are taken into account, but also the fact of universal religion. The second part, 'Exposition and Defence,' considers a number of problems, philosophical, psychological, and scientific, arising out of the general claim. The third part, 'Persistence and Renewal,' considers how the Revelation may maintain itself in a changing world, and—in particular—'whether there is still any better or more effective way to present it to men . . . than in those imaginative, emotional, and dramatic forms in which it was first clothed.'

Perhaps the most distinctive feature of the book is its stout defence, in the second part, of the doctrines of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection of Christ. These doctrines, as Professor Lewis maintains, should neither be rejected nor be reshaped to meet the requirements of a scientific age. They do not stand for 'parthenogenesis' and 'resuscitation.' As well seek scientific corroboration of them as of the Fatherhood of God, the Incarnation of the Eternal Son as Jesus Christ, or the Atonement made for sin in the sufferings and death of Christ. The Virgin Birth of Christ and His Resurrection are sheer miracle and part of the demand of the total Christian faith. The miracle of the Person of Christ carries with it every other miracle. Every related event, including Virgin Birth and Resurrection, falls within an order already established. The doctrine of the Virgin Birth may have been a late pronouncement, but the Christian Church saw in it 'a fitting capstone' to the rising structure of revealed truth.

It would be easy to criticise such a line of exposition. One might suggest that the doctrine of the Virgin Birth of Christ is not, like that of His Resurrection, organic to the structure of Christian theology. Or one might suggest that Professor Lewis is nearer than he thinks he is to a re-shaping of both doctrines in a symbolical sense. But we must close, and in closing we commend his book as a very useful introduction to recent discussions in the field of Christian apology.

W. Fulton.

THE SCOTTISH JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY.

A theological revival is under way in Scotland. The first number of the quarterly—*The Scottish Journal of Theology*—which is to be its organ of expression, has appeared, 'born of the conviction,' to quote the editors, 'that theology is a task urgent upon the whole Church.' The publishers are Messrs. Oliver & Boyd; the Editors are the Rev. Dr. Thomas F. Torrance of Aberdeen and the Rev. J. K. S. Reid of Edinburgh; and the cost is 3s. 6d. net quarterly.

In the first number, which wears an elegant blue cover with a cross in the centre, there are eight articles and five book reviews. Of the contributors nine are Presbyterians, two are Anglicans, and there is one Congregationalist. Three articles deal with dogmatic theology, three with Biblical theology, and two with applied theology.

After an editorial manifesto there follows an article by J. K. S. Reid on 'The Office of Christ in Predestination' in which, with copious quotations from the original Latin, the weaknesses of Calvin and his followers on this theme are sympathetically exposed. Professor Donald Mackinnon writes, out of deep Christian conviction and much philosophical profundity, on 'The Christian Understanding of Truth.' And the Rev. G. S. Hendry contributes a graceful and

penetrating article on 'The Exposition of Holy Scripture.' There is plenty of strong meat here—perhaps too much of it—for the ordinary minister.

In the Biblical theology section Professor George Johnston of Hartford writes on 'The New Testament Doctrine of the Spirit,' Dr. Torrance on 'The Old Testament Conception of the Grace of God,' and the Rev. R. Stuart Loudon reviews a book by the Swiss theologian Oscar Cullmann under the title of 'The Church of the Reigning Lord.' As a *Neutestamentler* I found this part of the journal much more interesting and easy to read, though I think that Cullmann's view of New Testament eschatology is open to very damaging criticism.

The ordinary minister will find the last two articles most useful of all. In the first, Professor Riddell, under the title 'A Question of Words,' considers how to translate the technical terms of the Faith into words that the ordinary man can understand. In the second, Bishop Stephen Neill, basing himself on a recent book by a German missionary to the Dyaks called Schärer, writes on the problems of the mission-field.

The book reviewers are Principal Duthie, the Rev. D. M. G. Stalker, Professor John Baillie and the Rev. Dr. John McConnachie, and of the books reviewed one is by the son, another by the brother of Karl Barth.

There is much to praise in this first number. I liked particularly the articles by G. S. Hendry and Stephen Neill. But I feel, as many ministers feel, that as a whole the writing is too heavy and technical. Can we not have in the second number something a little less severely theological, something more immediately intelligible to the busy minister whose philosophical studies are not in good repair and who has forgotten much of his Latin and most of his Hebrew, something, in fine, with a more popular appeal. Must the Queen of the sciences always walk in stiff brocades?

A. M. Hunter.

AN ARCHBISHOP SPEAKS.

Watchman, What of the Night? by Cyril Garbett, Archbishop of York (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net).

These eight addresses on problems of the day were given at different centres to the clergy and church-wardens of the Diocese of York on the occasion of the Archbishop's primary visitation. They begin with a sombre picture of the condition of the world to-day, and thereafter deal with the Christian attitude to six specific matters—marriage and divorce, the threat to the home, freedom in the modern State, the moral issues of the economic crisis, the Church and world order, and the insecurity caused by the Atomic Bomb. In the treatment of these problems the Archbishop is moved throughout by four main convictions. One is that this is one of the great crises of human history in which an old order is passing away and a new age has not come to birth. A second is that Christianity is now a minority religion, having lost its former domination over the Western world, and must depend for its influence on its message and its life. A third is that in spite of this altered status the Church possesses a supernatural gospel and life, and the world will only listen to it if it can offer a message and a power from God. Finally, it is only this supernatural gospel which will enable us to overcome the forces of evil which now threaten mankind with destruction and to solve problems which are so baffling and perplexing.

These convictions are the common possession of all Christian people and the main interest of the book is the way in which they are brought to bear on the six problems that are discussed in the successive chapters. As a matter of fact there is little that is contentious in these discussions. One might smile at the deft way in which the Archbishop gets round a difficult corner in the treatment of divorce. He accepts, and firmly asserts, the Anglican teaching about the finality of marriage, and the refusal to recognize (by a church service) the re-marriage of any divorced person. But this teaching appears to take with it the refusal of the Communion to the re-married person, as he (or she) is obviously living in sin. Dr. Garbett admits this but suggests that occasionally 'the law of logic must give way to the greater law of charity,' to which many of his readers will ask, 'Why does not the law of charity apply to the re-marriage of innocent persons?'

But that is a small affair compared with the great matters on which Dr. Garbett sheds the light of Christian principle. All the big problems which burden the hearts of Christian people are faced here and faced with sincerity and wisdom. It is probably true that, except in the narrowest circles, we have definitely put behind us the idea that Christianity has nothing to do with politics or economics. At any rate this influential Christian teacher enters boldly into all the fields of human interest and activity, with the message of the gospel on his lips. And what is the message? Dr. Garbett, with unerring wisdom, singles out the one truth that is common to all Christian bodies, the fundamental reality on which all depends, the Sovereignty of God over all life. That is the climax of Dr. Garbett's argument and his final word.

F. J. Rae.

THE FUTURE LIFE

It is a long, long time since a fellow mortal, musing over the mysteries of life and death and destiny, broke out in that moving appeal beginning—

> Pity our eagerness to know
> Whence we have come, and whither go.

We are here so short a time; like the shadow of a tiny cloud blown along the hills, and gone. And then, what then?

Here are two further books on the perennial problem of the Beyond. Neither author has the least doubt that one awaits us. Their endeavour is, with the New Testament before them, to try to meet wonder and questioning as to what it is likely to be, and kindred problems.

The one book, *Thinking Again about the Future Life*, by the Rev. S. Maurice Watts, B.D. (Independent Press; 4s. net), is quite short, some seventy pages. It is also very simple, with the simplicity of a good teacher. But there is reading behind it, and thinking in it; and it is set down with a forthright honesty, and a skill in getting to the point, and making it.

Some, probably, would praise it for its up-to-dateness. And, certainly, it deals with live and pertinent questions; comes, indeed, largely out of enigmas and perplexities that leapt at puzzled people in the grim war years—such as a mother who, not knowing that her boy had been killed, had been praying for him; and, having learned that he was dead, could not stop doing so, although she had been taught that prayers for the dead are at least futile, perhaps something gravely worse. Or others wondering about Spirit-communication. Is it possible? Is it desirable? Or what about this theory of Reincarnation, again blowing to and fro? For, really, such questions are not of an age, but for all time, and keep recurring, generation after generation. All which Mr. Watts examines, briefly indeed, but wisely and tenderly, basing himself on Scripture. And if one is inclined to feel that the sterner side of the New Testament is left too much in shadow, just then there comes a paragraph that proves that it too, if not underlined, is not forgotten. And the Christian hope of immortality is firmly based upon its authentic New Testament foundations.

The second volume is *The Life of the World to Come* (Longmans; 12s. 6d. net), by that Canon-Emeritus of Chichester, R. J. Campbell, D.D., whose name in the days when those of us now old were young blew clamorously about a corner of the world, so that he re-appears now like a ghost out of the very long ago. It is a bigger book (a hundred and ninety pages), designed upon an ampler scale, cooler in atmosphere, though here and there the glow of the preacher shines through the sober argument, more academic than the other, and, perhaps, less close to life. This, probably, may be accounted for, in part, by the fact that, as the author tells us, 'the following pages are addressed to persons usually called Spiritualists; and the facts set forth are assembled for the benefit of Spiritualists who are confessedly and militantly anti-Christian.'

For that task he has manifest qualifications. For forty years he has been a member of the Society of Psychical Research, joining it in order to receive its privately circulated 'Proceedings.' He had among his close friends Sir Oliver Lodge and Sir William Barrett, whose literary trustee Canon Campbell is. Incidentally, he quotes that great authority's article in *Light*, to which Mr. Watts also refers, in which he says, 'Can we not find a religion and so rest, in the teaching of Spiritualism? My own strong conviction is that we cannot. . . . And this conviction is not the result of any preconceived opinion, but of wide observation conducted with an honest desire to know the truth. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Weighed in the balances, Spiritualism AS A RELIGION is found wanting, for it is unable to satisfy the highest needs of man.'

Canon Campbell's is a scholarly piece of work, and fortified by many witnesses cited with skill. But why this particular line of argument was adopted to convince just these particular people is not to me altogether clear. But, in any case, one fancies that the book with its chapters on the Hades-Sheol Theory, the Apocalyptic, the Day of the Lord, the Risen Lord, the Larger Hope, the Heart of the Gospel, the Parousia, will have a message to many more than militant Spiritualists.

A. J. GOSSIP.

THE TRIUMPH OF GOD.

This book, *The Triumph of God*: A Series of Essays (Longmans; 15s. net), consists of fourteen essays or chapters by a group of friends, all of them 'members of the Anglican communion,' and all of them 'closely identified with the activity of making the Gospel known to all the world.' The editor is Canon Max Warren, the General Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, and of the twelve contributors the majority have had personal experience of missionary work in many parts of the world. They believe that 'the Gospel itself and the nature of our world together constitute this a day of judgment,' and, that being so, they are convinced that what is needed at the present time is a frank assessment of the actual situation in which the Church universal finds itself. Of the fourteen 'essays' which make up the book the first six consider the theological basis of the Church, while the rest are concerned with the Church's relations in the world with other religions, with secularism, and in the matter of its own disunity.

It is evident that this book demands from its contributors a wide range of knowledge if it is to attain its aim and to demonstrate anew to the contemporary world the means that are available to realize 'the triumph of God' and to quicken us to a new vividness of expectation and a new energy in action.

It is true, as Bishop Neill reminds us in his account of 'The Everlasting Gospel' that to say that the present time is a time of crisis is to emphasize what has always been. Bertrand Russell said recently that the greatest non-scientific discovery of our age has been a negative one, the discovery that mankind does not progress automatically, as men had almost persuaded themselves was the case. One who sees that in all its implications might well be on the way to become a Christian. 'Man never abideth in one stay,' as the Bishop says, and this in itself demands the intervention of God. 'Redemption comes always,' the same writer says, 'with the shock of surprise. It is the incredible. . . . If Christians cease to show the marks of surprise, they have ceased to be Christians.' That is a truth that pierces deep and may well test each one of us.

That is, perhaps, the prevailing note that is struck in this book, both in the title that it bears and in its contents. It centres round the Church

(' the recovery of the sense of the Church as essential to the Gospel is one of the outstanding developments in modern theology ') but it never forgets what a feeble instrument the Church is. Even ' the world-wide Church,' as the editor himself says in his closing chapter, is ' unbelievably weak,' but, as he also says, it is ' a becoming Church.' This book does not sentimentalize these titles by which we to-day rightly designate the Church. Its call is rooted in the fact of the helplessness of man the whole world over. In its successive chapters it considers without self-deception the world situation to-day and the sources of hope that are available to us in it. We see the churches in every land to be, as Mr. Milford says in his account of the Church in India, ' pathetically weak,' but neither he nor any other of the writers in this volume ever forgets that they are ' becoming ' churches. They are on the way to become the Kingdom of God—' when the strange and the new have birth, and power comes full into play,' the power, not of man, but of God.

N. MACNICOL.

Three new ' Mirfield Books ' have come to hand. Taking them in the order in which they are listed we notice first *The Sacrifice of the People*, by Joseph Barker, C.R. It is an effort to state and expound the Catholic tradition of Christianity's essential and typical sacrament, the Eucharist. Next we notice *Original Sin*, by the Rev. F. H. Maycock. It is an effort to expound this classical dogma as fundamentally the assertion that man was made for a supernatural, not a natural destiny, but that by his own fault he lost the possibility of fulfilling this destiny. Finally, there is *The Ultimate Choice*, by Douglas Edwards, C.R. In accordance with the sub-title, ' Belief or Fantasy,' the effort is here made to show that belief does matter, to discuss the incentive to belief (as the desire for life), and to set forth belief as the key to conduct. This last booklet is homiletical in its emphasis ; the previous two are more of the nature of essays. The publishers are the Dacre Press, and the prices are 2s. 6d., 3s., and 2s. 6d. net respectively. The whole series is put forth in the spirit and with the intention of the Oxford Movement, which in its famous ' Tracts for the Times ' sought to give orthodox teaching in clear and simple terms about fundamentals of the Christian Faith and Morals. The booklets are all well and ably written.

The need for re-education in the Christian faith is probably the reason why several publishing firms have begun to issue various series of books at a cheap price ' for those who ask " What is the Gospel ? " and " Is the Gospel true ? " ' One such is ' The Colet Library of Modern Christian Thought and Teaching,' edited by the Dean of St. Paul's and published by Messrs. Duckworth & Co. at 5s. net each. Three of this series have appeared, of which the first is a fresh and interesting study of the place of miracle in Christianity by Mr. Geoffrey Hoyland, M.A., bearing the title *The Resurrection Pattern*. We have to learn what he means by ' the filleted half-Christianity of a past Christianity ' and how it has to be replaced by the recognition of the Kingdom of Heaven as ' the key pattern of the universe, the continuum aspect of God Himself.' These ' meditations of a juryman ' on the miracles and the Resurrection are full of insight and sincerity.

The second volume on *The Gospel in the World* needs no further commendation when we know that it is by Professor Godfrey E. Phillips, M.A., of the Selly Oak Colleges. It deals with the Church and its ' increasing purpose.' Is it the case, as Professor Phillips says, that ' the Church has emerged from the War materially weakened but spiritually strengthened, and its fundamental faith is strong ' ? The revelation of evil that the War brought might well have strengthened the conviction that only God's power can save the world. If it has done so then we can hope again.

The third volume is *St. Mark's Gospel : A Modern Commentary*, by Canon E. Basil Redlich. It is modern in that it takes account of Form Criticism in estimating the historical value of Mark—perhaps too much account of it. It is certainly true, as Canon Redlich recognizes, that it is one of the weaknesses and limitations of this School ' that subjective judgments are identified with historical criticism.' He might have said many times, as he says once, ' We have no means of giving a final decision.' At the top of p. 53 the sentence about Jesus' attitude to His Messiahship seems to say the opposite of what is intended.

The Church in the Atomic Age (Independent Press ; 9d. net), by the Rev. Principal H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., D.D., does not attempt to do over again what has been done in the Report prepared by a Commission of the British Council of Christian Churches (' The Era of Atomic Power '), but seeks to carry a little farther than the Report carries it the consideration of the Church's duty in the present situation, and to do this with special reference to Congregational churches. The pamphlet reprints an article published in ' The Congregational Quarterly.'

The Story of Jericho, by John Garstang, M.A., D.Sc., F.S.A., Emeritus Professor of Archæology, University of Liverpool, and J. B. E. Garstang, M.A., Assistant Master, Rugby School (his son) (Marshall, Morgan & Scott ; 8s. 6d. net), now appears in a new and revised edition. An appreciative review of the first edition appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES in June 1940. There is very little change in the new edition, at least none substantial, and we can only repeat that this is one of the best examples of scientific research on the spot, so to speak, known to us. Dr. Garstang is a master in this field, and his book on the long story of Jericho is not only scientific and first-hand, but extraordinarily fascinating. Incidentally, the work of Dr. Garstang confirms in a remarkable way the account of the invasion in

Joshua and is a good example of the influence that archæological discovery is having in modifying the work and results of criticism. A word should be said in praise of the handsome form in which this edition is produced, and also in appreciation of the numerous plates and illustrations with which the volume is adorned and the text enlightened.

In *Richard Mayr* (Lutterworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), a diary and letters translated and edited by Lilian Stevenson from a memoir by his father, a picture is offered of an Austrian schoolboy intensely devoted to religion in public liturgy and private prayer and Bible study whose intention from a very early age was to devote his life to the reunion of Western and Eastern Catholicism. He was happy in his family relations, hated the idea of war, and detested the Nazi movement as it impinged on his plans for life. This record shows how, until he fell in battle in Russia aged nineteen, he managed to keep the rich content of life unaffected while submitting with some reluctance to being made an active unit in the Nazi war-machine. He ventures one or two criticisms but seems with tact to have avoided giving or finding trouble.

The interest of the book is mainly its evidence that an earnest, highly cultivated, altruistic and likeable lad in Austria was able to remain so little conscious of the pressure of the immediate public and international practical problems presented by the policies of Hitler's Reich.

The late Dr. P. T. Forsyth, Principal of Hackney College, London, exercised a great influence in his lifetime as a teacher, preacher, and author; and many can still recall him with affection and gratitude. And it looks as though there has been in recent years a revival of interest in his theological teaching, with its liberal testimony to Evangelical Faith. There should, therefore, be a good welcome for the recent volume which has been published to mark the centenary of his birth—*The Theology of P. T. Forsyth* (Lutterworth Press; 6s. net), especially as it has been attractively compiled by Mr. Gwilym O. Griffith. Mr. Griffith does well to sketch at the outset the background of Forsyth's thought, and to indicate the influence upon it of thinkers like Ritschl and Harnack. He has also succeeded within the limitations imposed upon him, or self-imposed, in presenting us with a useful exposition of Forsyth's thought directly based upon his writings. He tells us that his aim has been to offer a minimum of personal comment, critical or otherwise; but fortunately he gives us more of himself than in his modesty he thinks.

A very valuable monograph on Christian marriage by the late Rev. T. A. Lacey, D.D., F.S.A., Canon of Worcester, has for some time been out of print, and a fully revised and supplemented edition has been prepared by the Rev. R. C. Mortimer, B.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Regius Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology. The book in its original state was in a high degree authoritative and useful. It would not be easy to point to any better book on Christian marriage in its relation to the order of Nature, to human formal law, to the modern State or to Christian revelation. It was a really vital necessity that called for another edition that its erudition and helpfulness might be preserved, and this has been done by a republication by the S.P.C.K. under the previous title, *Marriage in Church and State* (10s. 6d. net). Professor Mortimer's revision is not by any means a formality. 'The book,' he says in a Preface to this second edition, 'remains substantially Lacey's book.' This is a modest statement, or perhaps is partly the product of the Professor's sense of humour. For he himself enumerates five additions or corrections or supplements that he has made. He corrects Lacey's judgment on St. Augustine's views about the dissoluble or indissoluble nature of marriage. He has rewritten the section on the teaching about divorce in the Gospels. He has rewritten the passages about various points (including divorce) in the Orthodox Churches. He has removed the closing part of the book and written a new chapter on the present position in England. And he has abandoned Canon Lacey's strictly limited use of the word divorce as likely to lead to misunderstanding. With these exceptions, and a fair amount of interpolating and glossing, and in the second half much complete re-writing, the book remains substantially Lacey's book. In any case it is an invaluable account, both of the history of marriage and of its legal and human and Christian aspects. It ought to be added that the book is handsomely produced and beautifully printed.

Two books on Prayer have come together as they might very well do since they cover the same ground. One, though new to this country and in its first edition here, has gone through forty editions in America. Its title is simply *Prayer*, and its author Professor O. Hallesby, a well-known figure in Norwegian theological circles. The publishers are the Inter-Varsity Fellowship and the price is 6s. net. It is the first of six books by the same author to be sponsored by the same publishers. As may be gathered from the publishers' name, the book is warmly evangelical, and a book which called for forty editions over the way may well be equally helpful here.

The other book is entitled *Prayer and the Christian Life* and is by Mr. Eric Hayman (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net). Its origin was in a Student Christian Movement Prayer School in 1946 and the addresses Mr. Hayman gave to this Conference are published very much as he delivered them. They make a very thoughtful book, very comprehensive and satisfying both to the mind and to the spirit. All aspects of the prayer life find a place here, and to those who are willing to pay the price the discipline of prayer expounded here will be abundantly helpful.

Unsolved New Testament Problems

The Place of Eschatology in the Fourth Gospel.

By the Reverend C. K. Barrett, B.D., The University, Durham.

The juxtaposition in the Fourth Gospel of mystical [1] and eschatological [1] sayings has often been felt as a problem. Since the former are more numerous (and, perhaps, more acceptable to the modern thinker) various expedients have been devised for the removal of the latter. They have been frankly excised as redactional additions to an original document; and they have been put down to the Evangelist's uncritical recollection of a manner of speech which was out of keeping with his theme. 'Ce messianisme, notre auteur le répudiait tout en en retenant l'étiquette.' [2] But such violent means of removing one of the elements of the problem have not proved permanently satisfying; nor was it to be expected that they should, and the tendency of recent work on the Fourth Gospel has been to reject them.[3] It is the office of a sound criticism not to cut but to untie knots. Certainly it has been impossible since the publication of Dr. Howard's Dale Lectures [4] to deny the presence in this Gospel of both a mystical and an eschatological element, and it is unnecessary now to repeat Dr. Howard's arguments, though they are of fundamental importance. It may suffice here to refer to the recurring phrase 'the last day'; the statement 'the hour cometh' [5]; the notion of a future (as well as a present) resurrection and judgment, and the plain allusion to Christ's return in $21^{22\,f.}$. These features can only be removed from the Gospel by the use of quite uncritical scissors, and the problem of the Johannine eschatology is not to be thus lightly dismissed by denying the existence of one of its components. On the other hand, it must be recognized that it is not, strictly speaking, a Johannine problem at all. It is a New Testament problem; for throughout the New Testament this tension, between a religion now experienced and an eschatological hope of blessedness yet to be, makes itself felt. This fact has been emphasized by Dr. Cullmann,[6] who has argued that this tension is in fact the constitutive factor in all New Testament theology. It appears in the partially 'realized' eschatology of the Synoptic Gospels, where the Kingdom of God is thought of as present in germ, and about to be revealed in power; and it appears in Paul's doctrine of the Holy Spirit, who as the 'earnest' is both a present anticipation of the blessings of the age to come, and also the pledge that there remains an age to come in which the present foretaste will give place to complete fulfilment. The Fourth Gospel, in revealing the same antinomy, does not stand apart from but is fully in line with the Christian tradition as a whole; and the primitive Christian tradition itself cannot be understood if this pervasive factor be left out of account.[7] Nevertheless, the problem becomes particularly acute in the Johannine writings,[8] and, since the mystical element so far outweighs the eschatological, presents itself in a unique form.

We shall first set out briefly the elements which compose the Johannine problem, and describe the background of thought which contributes to our understanding of them; and then consider some aspects of the problem itself.

[1] These words are often used, but neither is entirely satisfactory, and each requires careful definition. In this article 'mysticism' is used with a wide meaning, covering the whole range of immediate, personal, religious experience, in which a man is conscious of contact with God (or Christ). 'Eschatology' means a system of beliefs based upon a distinction between 'this age' and 'the age to come.'

[2] A. Loisy, *Le quatrième Évangile* [2] [1921], 58.

[3] A notable example of this tendency is the 3rd edition of R. H. Strachan's *The Fourth Gospel* [1941]. In the earlier editions he maintained a theory of editorial insertions; in the present edition he abandons it.

[4] W. F. Howard, *Christianity according to St. John* [1943]; see especially ch. v. 'Eschatology and Mysticism.'

[5] Where it (*a*) is not followed by the supplement 'and now is' and (*b*) does not refer to the hour of the death of Jesus.

[6] O. Cullmann, *Christus und die Zeit* [1946]. The point under discussion here is brought out very clearly in his article 'Das Wahre durch die ausgebliebene Parusie gestellte neutestamentliche Problem,' in *Theologische Zeitschrift*, iii. [1947] 177–191.

[7] I must here leave out of consideration the question whether the eschatological teaching of Jesus Himself was wholly 'futurist' or wholly 'realized,' or whether it too consisted of both strands of thought.

[8] The problem seems to me to become well-nigh insoluble if we regard the Apocalypse as written by the Evangelist. Yet that this is so is to-day, we are told, 'en passe de devenir l'opinion commune' (P. H. Menoud, *L'Évangile de Jean d'après les recherches récentes* [1943], 65.

I.

The most important points are these :

(*a*) ' Futurist ' eschatology is exceptionally rare in the Fourth Gospel. The demonstration (referred to above) that this element is not absent from the Gospel must not be allowed to mislead. That which in the Synoptic Gospels leaps to the eye must be sought in the Fourth ; it would be quite unnecessary [1] to prove that there was ' futurist ' eschatology in Mark, but for John the proof is by no means superfluous.

(*b*) Apocalyptic is entirely absent from John, though here and there an image (for example, that of childbirth [2] [Jn 16^{21}]) common in Apocalyptic is taken over for a different purpose. In particular we may observe that there is no parallel to the apocalyptic discourse of Mk 13 ; or rather, perhaps, that in place of this discourse there stand the dialogues and monologues of the Upper Room which stress the abiding presence of Christ with His own. John and Mark, as theological documents, stand close together ; but their emphases are not identical.

(*c*) The language of eschatology, and sometimes of Apocalyptic, is taken over for the purpose of mysticism. It will be sufficient to mention here the treatment of resurrection and judgment in ch. 5 ; that of resurrection in ch. 11 (see especially *vv.*$^{24f.}$: ' He shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day. . . . I am the resurrection, and the life '), and that of the coming of Christ in ch. 14 (and elsewhere).[3]

(*d*) We may notice not only the absence, or transformation, of the older language, but also the introduction of a new idiom. A characteristic feature of the Gospel is its use of sacramental expressions, derived from Hellenistic and Oriental religion rather than from the Old Testament or Judaism. An example which will be noted again below is the use of the language of rebirth by divine begetting in the conversation with Nicodemus.

These points may sufficiently define the eschatological problem as it confronts the reader of the Fourth Gospel. The background of the Gospel presents a similar state of complication.

(*a*) *The Christian Tradition.* It has already been indicated that the Johannine tension between a present realization and a future fulfilment of the promises of God is common to all parts of the New Testament ; and it is clear (see especially Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*) that whatever other sources and modes of thought may have been used by John, his primary purpose was to elucidate the material he had received.

(*b*) *Jewish Mysticism.* It must be recognized that the Jewish background of the Gospel is much more complicated than has sometimes been perceived. It would be quite misleading to identify ' Jewish ' with ' Apocalyptic.' That there is a mystical element in Jewish theology is a statement which needs no proof with regard to Alexandrian Judaism ; rather, it is worth pointing out that not even Philo was able to escape altogether from the universal Messianic beliefs.[4] On the other hand, it must be remembered that mysticism (as we have defined it) is certainly not confined to the writings of Philo. Palestinian Judaism also, devoted to the observance of Torah and excited by Apocalyptic as it was, was the field of much mystical speculation which turned the characteristic language of the Law and of the Last Days to its own purposes. Much of this very important material has been made available to students of the Fourth Gospel by Dr. Odeberg,[5] and by means of it some passages in the Gospel have been very convincingly explained.

(*c*) *Hellenistic Eschatology.* The Hellenistic background of the Gospel is as complicated as the Jewish. There was indeed little room for anything that could properly be called eschatology in the philosophies of the Hellenistic world.[6] But the mystery religions were essentially eschatological, and that not merely because of their offer of personal immortality. Each of these religions was based on a myth, which presented an account of the world and human life in narrative form. The story was still marching to its close, but it could be completely enacted sacramentally for the benefit of the initiate—a liturgical and mystical combination of ' futurist ' and ' realized ' eschatology.

It does not seem unreasonable to conclude, on the basis of the evidence which has now been sketched, that John, writing after a long period of reflexion upon the primitive Christian records and beliefs and in an environment in which both Jewish and pagan elements played their parts, should have developed his own characteristic form

[1] In 1948 ; the matter was different before the work of J. Weiss and Dr. A. Schweitzer.

[2] Note especially the use of חֶבֶל (ὠδῖνες), travail pains, to denote the ' sufferings which are to precede the advent of the Messiah ' (M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim*, etc. [1926], *s.v.*).

[3] See below for a short discussion of this chapter.

[4] See *De praem. et poen.*, 95 : There shall come forth a man, says the oracle (Nu 24^{7}, LXX), and leading his host to war he will subdue great and populous nations, etc.

[5] H. Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel interpreted in its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents* [1929].

[6] See W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* [1939], ch. i., ' The Failure of Eschatology.' The Stoic pyrosis, and the Epicurean dissolution of atoms, are not really eschatological because they are not really ends.

of Christian eschatology, and preserved its essential tension. We may now briefly examine his method of working.

II.

John (or perhaps we ought to say the final editor of the Gospel who added the last chapter) was certainly aware of the problems that were raised by the delay of the Parousia. He points out that the assumption that the Beloved Disciple would survive until the Parousia had no necessary basis in the words ascribed to Jesus. It seems plain that this eminent Christian was not long dead and that his departure before the return of Christ had caused speculation and anxiety. John's treatment of the point (21$^{22f.}$) is worthy of note. It would have been possible for him to argue that the common view depended upon a false understanding of the meaning of the coming of Christ, and that Christ had in fact come, in a spiritual manner, to the Beloved Disciple (at the Resurrection, or in the giving of the Spirit, or at the Disciple's death). But he does not attempt this line of argument. Rather he seems quite content to share the common opinion, and indeed at the close of his Gospel to reiterate it, simply pointing out that Jesus had been rebuking Peter, not making a prediction.

The problem of the Parousia, though given point by the Beloved Disciple's death, was nevertheless much wider. The earlier tradition had declared that the Kingdom would come in power during the life-time of the first generation of Christians (Mk 9^{1}); and it had not come. At Jn 14^{22} we hear the complaint of those who had been disappointed by the failure of their hope that Jesus in a speedy and impressive appearance would vindicate His claims and their faith in the eyes of the whole world. Much of this chapter is concerned with the 'Coming' of Jesus, and though it is difficult to determine the exact bearing of some of the references we may trace out what appears to be a gradual progression of thought. The most natural interpretation of *vv.*$^{2f.}$ applies them to the Parousia of Christ in the ordinary sense; Jesus will return to receive His disciples into heaven, His Father's house.[1] At v.^{18} the thought turns to the immediate separation between Jesus and the disciples at the Crucifixion, and Jesus promises His return at the Resurrection. This in turn gives rise to the question why Jesus had been vindicated not in an open revelation in glory that should be visible to all, but only in Resurrection appearances to chosen witnesses; why not to the world? The answer is not a denial that Jesus will be manifested to the world; only the manner of the manifestation is not to be that of apocalypse (cf. Mk 13^{26}, Rev 1^{7}: 'Every eye shall see him'). To those who love Him and who keep His word Jesus, and His Father, will come, and they will make their abode (μονή, the word used at *v.*^{2} to describe the dwelling places of heaven) with them. These are they who (17^{20}) believe in Jesus through the Apostles' word; Jesus is manifested to them as they are chosen out of the world.

The thought of this chapter seems then to move through three stages: first, the return of Jesus to welcome His people to heaven: second, His return from death, and, finally, the Parousia that takes place when a man becomes a Christian. John does not deny the first two, but the drive of his thought is towards the last. His mind is focused upon the interval between the Resurrection and the final Parousia. It is at this point that John, like Paul, introduces the notion of the Holy Spirit, though it is hardly true that he substitutes the coming of the Paraclete for the coming of Jesus.[2] The place of the Spirit in Johannine theology is not easy to define, but it would perhaps be nearer the truth to say that He is the means by which the historical past and the historical future (in the two 'Comings' of Jesus) are brought to bear upon the present in such a way as to determine the significance of the immediate, spiritual, presence of Jesus.

III.

That Jesus should 'come' in this manner, not to the world at large but to the man who believes, is a prolongation of John's treatment of His Messiahship. The Messianic Secret as it is presented in Mark has already been treated in this series of articles.[3] The theme of secrecy is obscured in Matthew and Luke; but in John it comes to the surface again, though, as might be expected, in a form quite different from the Marcan. There are, for example, no commands that miracles should not be reported; and since there are no exorcisms there is no occasion to enjoin silence upon the demons. But in fact the Secret is more clearly expressed in John even than in Mark. Thus at 8^{25} the Jews ask Jesus outright, 'Who art thou?' and His reply is evasive. At 10^{24}

[1] So Westcott and Bernard; also Hoskyns, though he adds that the 'thought of the final advent of the Lord and the eschatological reunion of the disciples with Him does not exhaust the conception of His coming' (*The Fourth Gospel* [1940], 534).

[2] 'Between the first and the second *coming* of Jesus there lies the coming of the Paraclete. . . . The *coming* of the Paraclete signifies the unbroken continuation of the *coming* of Jesus' (J. Schneider, in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* [1933 ff.], ii. 670).

[3] By Dr. Vincent Taylor, *The Expository Times*, lix. [1948], 146–151.

there is an even more striking instance. Once more the Jews ask Jesus who He is, in the words, 'How long dost thou hold us in suspense? If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly.' The same theme appears at the beginning of ch. 7, when the brothers of Jesus urge Him to go up to the Feast of Tabernacles, so that His disciples and His work may be publicly recognized, 'for no man doeth anything in secret, and himself seeketh to be known openly.' Jesus does not follow their advice, but later goes up to the feast οὐ φανερῶς, ἀλλὰ ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ. The miracle at Cana (2^{1-11}) is similar. Here the mother of Jesus urges Him to take action; He apparently refuses to do so, and when He subsequently acts it is in such a way that only the household servants know the origin of the wine He provides. Over against such passages as these, however, others must be ranged in which the claims of Jesus are stated with perfect plainness, and in some of which the title Messiah is unhesitatingly used. Before the ministry itself begins John the Baptist declares, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world'; and goes on to describe Jesus in language drawn, it seems, from the Marcan Baptism narrative. At 1^{49} Nathanael says to Jesus, 'Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art King of Israel'; and earlier Andrew had declared, 'We have found the Messiah.' Jesus acknowledges to the Samaritan woman that He is the Messiah (4^{26}); and so on. In addition to directly Messianic sayings there is a wealth of material in which Jesus speaks of Himself as the Son, the Light, the Life, and by many other titles. We have here a stranger paradox than the 'secret epiphanies' of Mark; but the explanation is not remote. The Marcan secret is rooted in the eschatological dualism of time, the tension between 'now' and 'then.'[1] The revelation of God in Jesus is expressed in both humiliation and power, and the two are chronologically disposed; the glory follows the shame. It is part of the humiliation of the Son of man that He should remain in obscurity. But John works (generally, not always) in terms of a different kind of dualism and in his Gospel humiliation and glory are co-existent, not successive, aspects of the one act of revelation in Christ. Thus the 'hiddenness' and the 'revealedness' of the Messiah do not follow one another in temporal sequence; both are true and simultaneous characteristics of the one Person, and the question whether He be a manifest or a concealed Messiah depends partly upon the beholder, though ultimately upon God, who alone can open men's eyes and draw them to Jesus. They either come, or do not come, to the Light.

It is this kind of Messiahship, both manifest and hidden, and in itself timeless, which John projects into the future at $14^{22f.}$, and allows to stand beside the more primitive eschatological view. In this way he provides a rational explanation of the period between the Ascension and the Parousia.

By the same means he makes possible a wide extension of Christian terminology. We have already drawn attention to the introduction of a new idiom, that of sacramentalism, as a characteristic of the eschatological problem of the Fourth Gospel. It is here that this enrichment of the Christian vocabulary finds its justification. It is an enrichment which orthodox Judaism had never been prepared to accept,[2] and with good reason. To speak of the direct action of God in making a man a 'new creature,' or in regenerating him, was impossible because it obliterated the distinction between this age and the age to come. Matthew speaks as a Jew, and no doubt as Jesus spoke, when he employs the term παλιγγενεσία not for the rebirth of a person but for the eschatological reconstitution of the world. John, however, is able to use freely the conception of a divine begetting by water and Spirit ($3^{3.5}$), precisely because the temporal distinction between this age and the age to come was in process of dissolution. It was no longer necessary or indeed possible to safeguard the 'otherness' of God, as Judaism had done, by asserting that at some future time the Kingdom of God would descend from heaven (ἄνωθεν) with power. Already it was possible for a new existence (it was still ἄνωθεν) to possess a man so that he might see and enter the Kingdom of God.

So much John brings out with great clarity and force. But he never falls into the error of the Christian Gnostics who taught that the Resurrection had already taken place (2 Ti 2^{18}) and been exhausted, as it were, in the contemporary experience of Christians. The hour had come when the dead should hear the voice of the Son of man and live; but the hour was still to come when those who were in the tombs should hear His voice and come out to a resurrection of life or of judgment. The problem of Johannine eschatology lies in the Evangelist's firm maintenance of this essentially Christian tension, and his use of new insights, and new terminology, in expressing it.

[1] V. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 150 f.

[2] The few Rabbinic passages which compare a newly baptized proselyte to a new-born child do not seem to be exceptions to this statement.

Religion and the Variety of Religions.

By Professor H. L. Stewart, M.A., D.Phil., Dalhousie University, Halifax.

Toleration is an herb of spontaneous growth in the soil of indifference. . . . And by this all religions may agree together. But that were not a natural union, produced by the active heat of the spirit, but a confusion rather, arising from the want of it; not a knitting together, but a freezing together (Coleridge).

Does the multiplicity of religions justify, as it beyond doubt often promotes, suspicion that the religious interpretation of experience is in essence illusory?

There is a natural shock to faith in sudden discovery that the Creed of one's own inheritance is held no more strongly or sincerely than that of Islam or Buddhism or Shinto by those born to its ritual and traditions. The contrasts and controversies within Christendom itself become for many a like painful puzzle, especially when those whom such divisions separate seem unable to understand one another's existence and fall back on the desperate explanation of imputing to one another deliberate fraud. It is impossible, the naïve observer exclaims, that any intelligent person can believe what So-and-so says he believes, and a guess is made at some personal advantage which So-and-so may secure by pretence of such belief. As one becomes ashamed, however, of such wholesale suspicion of everybody who disagrees with one's self, the alternative may steal into one's mind—that we are all alike deluded, all superstitious though under different sorts of disguise, all 'wishful thinkers,' all in a measure driven by irrational fear or lured by irrational hope, and that what we call our religions are just so many empty dreams we have indulged in for ourselves, varied in form of local or temporal expression, but with such kernel the same for all.

This account of the case seems often to be recommended as new. It is a discovery, we are told, of modern science and modern historical criticism, emancipating the human mind. The truth is that it is far from new; it is of the most venerable antiquity; it was stated with an epigrammatic wit at least equal to that of its present advocates twenty-four hundred years ago. From time to time it recurs on the lips or from the pen of some one who is sure it is an achievement of his own enlightened Age, and not seldom sure that he himself is original in thus breaking the shackles of intellectual bondage. To anyone who has made a serious study of the history of thought there is constant amusement in the simplicity of those innovators admiring themselves for a discernment never before shown, when they are but trying again a guess thousands of years old, putting forward once more interpretations whose incoherence has been many times exposed, and venturing again predictions already falsified more times than the historian can take the trouble to count.

Lucretius explained—or rather explained away—Religion after the manner I have indicated, in *De Rerum Natura*, approximately two thousand years ago. One gets the same idea in Byron's *Curse of Minerva*, setting forth reflections on a tour in Greece:

> And yet unwearied still my footsteps trod
> O'er the vain shrine of many a vanish'd god.

There is a mournful passage, too, in James Anthony Froude's *The Nemesis of Faith*. It recalls the origin of the word 'pagan.' *Pagani* originally meant villagers, from *pagus* a village. When Christianity had been made the official religion of the Roman Empire, and measures were being taken to stamp out the cult of the old gods, it was found easiest to achieve this in the cities, the rural areas being more tenacious of the traditional piety. So the villagers were stigmatized as having the largest proportion of unbelief, and thus 'pagan' acquired the sense in which we now understand that word. Froude wondered whether Christianity itself might not have a fate similar to that of the old Roman cults which it superseded. Already he thought he saw it being driven into rural areas, dying where the old cults first died, and lingering where they lingered.

Gibbon's remark that religions are to the simple equally true, to the philosopher equally false, and to the ruler equally useful suggests that their variety is determined by the varying interests of those who cherish or use them. Such dismissal of religious beliefs as either imposture or delusion was characteristic of the eighteenth century—that period so well described by Mark Pattison as one whose poetry was without romance, whose philosophy was without depth and whose public men were without character ('its very merits of the earth, earthy'). Its thinkers tended in extraordinary degree to satisfy themselves with explanation of great movements or great institutions of the past as products of successful fraud, a quick and easy method of escape from facing the intricacies of their history. The method was all the more agreeable on that account to eighteenth-century thinkers, who were—with some notable exceptions—conspicuously unhistorical in their habits of mind. They liked to speak of their own Age as that of 'Illumination,' by contrast with Ages

which had been 'Dark,' but of those so-called Dark Ages which they so readily dismissed, they knew, by comparison with historians of the present, almost nothing.

It was not religion alone, it was also morals and government and law that outstanding eighteenth-century thinkers explained away as the product of cunning conspirators who for their own ends took advantage of the credulous. They delighted in pictures such as those drawn by Machiavelli, of whom Anatole France said he deserved gratitude for having removed from Law its legendary foundation in justice. They propagated sedulously the doctrine of the State as having arisen by 'social contract,' and hence as dissoluble by repudiation of the contract; an affair of mere varying convenience, every group competing with other groups in an utterly selfish struggle for power. The innumerable variations of Law and of State constitution from period to period or from country to country were cited gleefully as proof that no basis more fundamental than that of caprice in the larger or more powerful number could be found for those institutional forms. A like analysis was applied to systems of morals.

But surely there at least we are no longer misled. We emphatically do not decide that the differences of moral code from period to period and from country to country are evidence of a purely imaginative contrast between moral good and evil. We recognize indeed a bewildering conflict of opinion about what things are right and what things are wrong, but we turn a deaf ear to the occasional insinuation that this shows the absurdity of approving or condemning anything except as a statement of personal taste. That all morality is merely conventional, with no basis in 'Nature,' but created by the caprice of those in power at a particular time or place, and hence reversible as the balance of such power changes, has indeed been argued many times since it was first put forward as a theory by the Sophist whom Socrates opposed more than twenty-three centuries ago. It remains an underlying thought—so far as they contain thought—of novels of the present time. But although many argue for this thesis, and still more act as if they believed it, no one seems really to believe it; for those who assert it most loudly turn out to be sure of the objective validity of at least their own condemnations and approvals. They do not intend this spectacle as a jest, or realize that they are actually illustrating in themselves the very practice on which they pour verbal ridicule. They simply cannot rid themselves of the conviction that the contrast of 'right' with 'wrong' belongs to the objective nature of things, and that difference of opinion in this field is no more against such objective moral validity than differences of human calculation disprove the validity of arithmetic. As Plato said, scepticism in such matters, in order to be safe, must be silent, for as soon as the sceptic begins to argue, he is found to invoke the very considerations he is attempting to invalidate. This surely is the key to the observed fact that always some new moral rule or ideal is found to be set up by those who have been most insistent that ideals are a delusion and rules an imposture.

In like manner the succession of religions is far more instructive by its persistence of purpose than by its variety of form. Here, in truth, is the explanation of the quest constantly renewed though it has so often proved fruitless, for what is called 'the common element' in them. The eighteenth-century Deists, as they struggled to formulate what they called 'Natural Religion,' had an admirable aspect too often forgotten in the chorus of ridicule to which their follies have been subjected. In search of uniformity and universality, they rejected all religions of alleged special revelation to a particular people at a particular place or time. Hence they eliminated miracle, and specific Divine intervention in the course of things, as implying favouritism towards that section of mankind for which the wonder was performed. The Deists searched for some single belief, or a few beliefs, common to all known religions, as early exponents of jurisprudence searched for a common element in all known systems of Law, with the purpose of finding thus the Religion, as jurists had found the Law, of Nature. If only they could set forth a *religio gentium* which would reveal the *religio naturae*, even as the *lex naturae* had been identified in the *lex gentium!* Twin delusions, which we may well bury—as F. H. Bradley would have said—in a common grave! There is no such common element, in religions or in laws. And yet in both cases there was a truth underlying the falsity. What is really common is not a tenet within, but a movement behind. The Deists made innumerable historical blunders writing the history of religion out of their heads, to illustrate their preconceived thesis. Everywhere they assumed that Religion begins with a Creed of some kind, a set of intellectual propositions, from which feelings and purposes are derived by inference. But the sequence is *vice versa*, as historical jurisprudence might have suggested sooner for historical theology. Feelings and purposes (above all, moral values) are the precondition, the basis of a Creed. And if anyone supposes that unity, elusive in the data of the moral nature, can be imposed by an authoritative Dogma, one may say of him as Huss when yet another orthodox enthusiast cast a torch on the pile round him at the stake: *O sancta implicitas.*

NOW IN ITS FIFTH YEAR

THEOLOGY TODAY

Editor: JOHN A. MACKAY

CONTENTS OF THE JULY NUMBER

Editorial:

A Foreword to Ecumenical Gatherings
The Things that Cannot Be Shaken

The Church and Our Times	Oscar F. Blackwelder
A Theology of Hope for the Philosophy of Despair	Bela Vasady
Christian Eschatology and Social Thought	Ray C. Petry
Church Union—Organic or Federal?	F. W. Dillistone
The Strategy of the Remnant	W. Burnet Easton, Jr.
Vengeance and the Moral Order	Otto A. Piper
The Practical Bearing of the Reformed Faith	J. M. Shaw
The Calvinistic Conception of the State	Werner Richter
Between Yesterday and Tomorrow	Joseph L. Hromádka
Theological Table-Talk	H. T. Kerr, Jr.
The Church in the World	Elmer G. Homrighausen

Book Reviews by a dozen reviewers

The Aims of THEOLOGY TODAY

To contribute to the restoration of theology in the world of today as the supreme science, of which both religion and culture stand in need for their renewal.

To study the central realities of Christian faith and life, and to set forth their meaning in clear and appropriate language.

To explore afresh the truths which were rediscovered by the Protestant Reformation, especially the tradition usually called Reformed, and to show their relevancy to the contemporary problems of the Church and society.

To provide an organ in which Christians whose faith is rooted in the revelation of God in the Bible and in Jesus Christ, and who are engaged in different spheres of intellectual activity, may combine their insights into the life of man in the light of God, with a view to interpreting our human situation and developing a Christian philosophy of life.

More and more THEOLOGY TODAY is becoming indispensable for every earnest minister and layman who desires to be kept in touch with the issues in thought and life that concern evangelical Christianity in our time. In many parts of the world the Review is now hailed as the most helpful and dynamic journal of its kind.

"The Life of Man in the Light of God"

Published quarterly by: THEOLOGY TODAY, P.O. Box 29, Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A. Subscription rates, United States, Canada and Mexico, $2.00 per year; the British Empire, except Canada, 10/- per year (British Agent: B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., Oxford, England); all other countries, $2.50 per year in U.S. funds.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post. Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2. *Annual Subscription, including postage, 16s. 6d.*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD. LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£7, 7s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*